

283089

JPRS-TAC-85-019

19 July 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

19980722 108

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

11
157
A08

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

19 July 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

GENERAL

Moscow TV Show Sees U.S. Seeking To Break Military Parity (Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin; Moscow Television Service, 29 Jun 85)	1
UN Anniversary	1
U.S. Seeks Military Superiority	2
U.S. Plans for 'Star Wars'	3
Political Implications of Plans	4
U.S.-NATO Relations	4
Economic Balance	7
U.S. Claims of USSR Violations	7
U.S. 'Violations' Noted	8
Geneva Talks	9
Regional Conflicts	10
Change in U.S. Policy	10
Soviet Policy	11
Soviet Premier, Finnish President Discuss CDE, Nordic NFZ (Various sources, 18, 19 Jun 85)	12
Hold Talks	12
Helsinki Report on Talks	13
Tikhonov Addresses Meeting	13
Gorbachev Discusses Arms Issues With Vietnamese Leader (Moscow PRAVDA, 29, 30 Jun 85; Moscow TASS, 28 Jun 85)	15
PRAVDA Reports Talks	15
Gorbachev on INF in Europe, Asia	16
Joint Declaration	18
USSR: Arms Issues Highlighted on UN Anniversary (Moscow PRAVDA, 26 Jun 85; Moscow TASS, 24 Jun 85)	21
PRAVDA Editorial	21
Foreign Ministry Meeting	23

USSR Roundtable on Importance of Arms Control to East-West Ties (Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 26 Jun 85)	25
PRAVDA Observer on USSR's Asian Security Policy (Vsevolod Ovchinnikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Jun 85)	35
IZVESTIYA Previews 'Pacem in Maribus' Oceans Forum (A. Kolodkin, V. Kotlyar; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 27 May 85) ...	39
Socialist International Bureau Meeting Discusses Arms Control (Moscow TASS, 18, 19 Jun 85)	42
Palme Opens Meeting	42
Sorsa Reports on Disarmament	42
TASS: Physicians Against Nuclear War Hold Symposium (Moscow TASS, 22 Jun 85)	44
Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman on U.S. Ties, Arms Control (Vladimir Lomeyko Interview; Prague Television Service, 26 Jun 85)	45

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Gorbachev: USSR 'Will Assess Situation Anew' if SDI Continues (Mikhail Gorbachev; Moscow Television Service, 26 Jun 85)	48
USSR's Ponomarev Discusses Arms Issues With Spanish Leaders (Various sources, various dates)	51
Talks With Senate Leaders	51
Meeting With Parliament Members	53
Joint Announcement	56
Ponomarev Writes in Spanish Paper, by Boris N. Ponomarev	58
Karpov Discusses Talks With WFTU Delegation (Moscow TASS, 12 Jun 85; Moscow Domestic Service, 14 Jun 85)	60
Meeting Reported	60
Commentary on U.S. Attitude, by Viktor Levin	60
TASS Reports Proceedings 24-27 June (Moscow TASS, various dates)	62
Plenary Meeting 24 June	62
Space Arms Group 25 June	62
Strategic Arms Group 26 June	62
INF Group 27 June	62

SPACE ARMS

Moscow on U.S. Space Arms Research, Impact on ABM Treaty (Moscow in English to North America, 22 Jun 85)	63
PRAVDA: U.S. Space Arms Programs Violate ABM Treaty (Vitaliy Korionov; Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Jun 85)	65
USSR: Further Comment on West European Response to SDI (Moscow TASS, various dates; Moscow World Service, 30 Jun 85)	67
NATO Leaders' 'Evasive Approach'	67
West German Debates	68
French Premier Opposed	69
European Symposium To Advocate SDI	69
Anti-SDI Forum in Geneva	70
'Serious Misgivings'	70
USSR's Arbatov Warns That SDI 'Playing With Fire' (G. Arbatov; Moscow PRAVDA, 1 Jul 85)	72
USSR: U.S. Seeks To Evade ABM Treaty With SDI (Moscow TASS, 27 Jun 85)	76
Soviet Comments on Shuttle Mission To Test Laser for SDI (Various sources, various dates)	78
Discovery Launched	78
Laser Weapons Experiment	78
Failure of First Test	79
Impact on Geneva Talks	80
Success Reported	81
USSR's Bovin Explains Soviet Opposition to SDI (A. Bovin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 18, 23 Jun 85)	82
Defensive Purpose Denied	82
Quest for Superiority Seen	85
USSR: Comments on Japanese Technical Participation in SDI (Moscow TASS, various dates)	88
'Dazzled' by U.S. Plans	88
U.S. Plans To Use Japanese Equipment	88
Japanese Business Involved for 2 Years	89
Moscow Sees Evidence of Japanese Plans To Join SDI (Moscow Domestic Service, 29 Jun 85)	91

Soviet Army Paper on Military Aims of Shuttle Program (V. Chernyshev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 19 Jun 85)	93
Soviet Defense Journal on Uses of Space Shuttle (V. Gorenko; Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, No 4, Apr 85)	96
French Defense Minister on SDI, EUREKA (Charles Hernu Interview; Paris LE MATIN, 28 Jun 85)	107
EC's Delors Wants Mandate To Negotiate on SDI (Paris AFP, 26 Jun 85)	109
Greece Expresses Reservations on EUREKA Program (Athens TO VIMA, 22 May 85)	110

SALT/START ISSUES

PRAVDA Weekly Review Sees U.S. Attempts To Circumvent SALT II (Igor Melnikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 16 Jun 85)	112
Hungary on U.S. SALT II Stance (Istvan Kulcsar; Budapest Domestic Service, 7 Jun 85)	115

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Soviet Military Journal on French SSBN Fleet (S. Grechin; Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE, No 4, Apr 85)	117
PRAVDA Editorial Article on Euromissiles, Geneva Talks (Moscow TASS, 19 Jun 85)	121

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

USSR: Bloc Proposals Praised, NATO Proposals Criticized (N. Yuryev; Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, No 6, Jun 85)	125
--	-----

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

Soviet Reports on Opening of Summer Session (Various sources, 23, 24 Jun 85)	132
Commentary Attacks U.S., by Tomas Kolesnichenko	132
Auxiliary Committee on Space Arms	133
Comment on Its Purpose, by Viktor Levin	133

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

Czechoslovak Correspondent Reports on State of Talks (Bedrich Zagar; Bratislava PRAVDA, 21 Jun 85)	135
---	-----

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U.S. Production, Use of Bacteriological Arms Alleged (A. Konstantinov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 6 Apr 85) ...	137
USSR: U.S. Violates 1925 Geneva Chemical Arms Protocol (A. Mozgovoy; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 20 Jun 85)	139
TASS: Implications of U.S. Binary-Arms Decision for Proposed Ban (Moscow TASS, various dates)	141
Deployment in Europe Predicted	141
U.S. Blocks Ban	142
U.S. Speeding Up Program	143
PRAVDA Reports German Parties' Press Conference on Weapons-Free Zone (Moscow PRAVDA, 22 Jun 85)	144

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

Moscow: Greece Repeats Intention To Close U.S. Bases (Moscow Domestic Service, 24 Jun 85)	145
IZVESTIYA Answers Letter on Nordic NFZ Proposal (G. Valko; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 12 Jun 85)	146
Icelandic Government Criticized in Handling Nuclear Arms Ban (Staksteinar; Reykjavik MORGUNBLADID, 1 Jun 85)	148

NUCLEAR TESTING

Briefs	
Australia Welcomes Calls for Ban	150
PRAVDA Reports French Test	150

GENERAL

MOSCOW TV SHOW SEES U.S. SEEKING TO BREAK MILITARY PARITY

OW290933 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0612 GMT 29 Jun 85

["Studio 9" program, presented by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, Soviet television and radio political observer, with Colonel General Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of a directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin]

[Excerpts] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are meeting with you in Studio 9 of the Ostankino Television Center for our monthly talk devoted to topical problems of world politics. Taking part in today's talk are Col Gen Nikolay Fedorovich Chervov, chief of directorate of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, and political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin.

UN Anniversary

Our talk is taking place during extremely significant days. Exactly 40 years ago, in San Francisco, the representatives of 50 world states signed the Charter of the United Nations Organization, which was being created at that time, defining the main goals of the organization: the basic norms of international affairs. On instructions from the Soviet Government, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko signed the Charter on behalf of our country.

Establishing the United Nations Organization, the peoples of the world, who had just experienced the bloodiest war mankind had known, pinned considerable hopes on it. Marking the 40th anniversary of the existence of this organization today -- and, in this connection, 1985 has been proclaimed UN Year -- we can note that much has been achieved in past years in the sphere of international cooperation. The very date being marked -- 40 years of the existence of the United Nations Organization -- attests to much: 40 years is a considerable period, and during this period the dangerous plans of the enemies of peace have been, and are being, thwarted.

Our country, the Soviet Union, plays a leading role in this. Here is an example: The Soviet Union has advanced more than 130 proposals, constructive and developed proposals, in this period, just on questions of disarmament and halting the arms race.

At the same time, one has to say that, far from what was thought and planned by the creators of the idea of the unification of nations has been implemented. I think I would not be wrong to say that the reason for this is the policy of the imperialist powers, primarily the United States. Washington's course, dangerous to the cause of peace, particularly worsened at the end of the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's.

U.S. Seeks Military Superiority

When the Republican administration came to power in Washington, it, strictly speaking, did not conceal its desire to upset the prevailing military and strategic balance, and to tip the scales of military superiority in favor of the United States. Such plans were openly proclaimed at the beginning of the 1980's.

However, time flies. We are now in the middle of the 1980's, and I think that it would be quite appropriate to examine how Washington's plans appear from today's viewpoint, and how one would assess the political-strategic and military-strategic situation in the contemporary world. Let us begin our talk with a reply to this question. I ask you, Nikolay Fedorovich, to begin.

[Chervov] If one talks about the military aspects of the current situation, one should first of all emphasize the unprecedented scale of military preparations by the United States and NATO. The United States has unleashed an unrestrained arms race. It out-putting into operation increasingly updated nuclear and conventional arms systems, and spending enormous funds on them.

Why is this being done? There is one goal: the achievement of military superiority. Now, Valentin Sergeyevich, one can indeed observe in the United States a kind of nostalgia for the 1950's, when it had a strategic advantage. However, the world has changed greatly since then. The socialist states have, through common efforts, achieved military-strategic parity with the NATO bloc. The prevailing approximate military balance is a reliable guarantee for the socialist states' security and for strengthening peace on earth.

However, peace under conditions of equality does not suit Washington. Strategic parity is not to the liking of the U.S. leaders. It is difficult for them to acknowledge that today they can talk to us only on equal terms. This leads to their attempt to regain military superiority at all costs. The U.S. and NATO path to military superiority is contained in their military budgets and programs, worked out until the end of this century.

Conducting this course, the United States and NATO have taken the path of direct, forceful pressure on the Soviet Union and the socialist countries. They are striving to change the entire strategic situation in their favor, and blackmail us with the threat of war. With this aim, the United States is creating the potential for a disarming, nuclear first strike. I shall enumerate just the names of weapons systems: the MX ICBM; the strategic missiles Trident I and II; the heavy bombers B-1B and Stealth; Pershing II, and thousands of variously based cruise missiles. All this is first strike potential.

Nuclear war strategy is concealed behind the White House's peaceful rhetoric. The United States is also increasing the potential of conventional armaments, which can be used to strike at Warsaw Pact forces over the entire depth of their deployment. The point here is that the nuclear arms race, begun by the United States, has failed to give it any advantage. You know that the United States has been adopting one strategic program after another. That includes armadas of heavy bombers, missile-carrying submarines, the creation of nuclear charges, with separate, individually targeted warheads, and cruise missiles. Yet none of these arms systems has managed, and will not manage, to improve its own security. On the contrary, because of the Pentagon leaders' shortsightedness, serious damage is being done to the security of the United States as each of these programs, each of the U.S. strategic arms systems, is being countered by a commensurate response by the Soviet Union. In such circumstances, and for these reasons, the United States has chosen space as a new area to obtain an advantage over the socialist countries.

U.S. Plans for 'Star Wars'

White House leaders intoxicate themselves with the dream that, with the aid of "star wars," they will manage to gain a breakthrough in the military aspect, and dictate their will to the Soviet Union. What is being planned in Washington? To create an antimissile shield over the United States, which means to protect U.S. territory with a multitiered antimissile defense and thus deprive the Soviet Union of the possibility of delivering a return strike.

Simultaneously, Washington is planning to increase its nuclear first strike potential by which it means to have an invincible sword among the arms I have mentioned, and additionally deploy new strategic forces, based in space, for the purpose of hitting targets on land, at sea, in the air, and in space.

The final task is to acquire, with the aid of the shield, and of the invincible sword, the capability of delivering a nuclear strike with impunity against the Soviet Union, and thus achieve decisive military superiority over the socialist countries. That is the essence of the U.S. "star wars" plan.

Pentagon leaders' statements to the effect that "star wars" is a kind of defense and that the space arms being developed in the United States are allegedly harmless means is nothing less than political shamanism and deception of the people. Any military specialist knows that the space arms being created can be used both for defensive, and mostly for offensive, purposes. The space arms now being created in Washington are intended, primarily, for offensive use. However hard the United States tries to justify "star wars," the implementation of President Reagan's so-called SDI [Strategic Defense Initiative] will lead to the emergence of space weapons. This means that, in the arms race, humanity will cross the dangerous point from which there may be no return. That is why we persistently propose not to convert space into a new source of military threat, not to create space strike weapons. In this case, it would be possible to radically reduce nuclear arms and gradually proceed to their complete elimination.

As has been repeatedly announced at the highest level, the Soviet Union is not striving for military superiority, either on land or in space. It is doing its utmost to stop the arms race. But, if the preparations for "star wars" continue, then, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has indicated, we shall have no other option than to take counter-measures, including, of course, increasing and perfecting offensive nuclear arms.

This gives rise to the question of whether it will be possible to prevent the deployment of space strike arms and stop the arms race in space. This question is acquiring primary importance. The future development of the military-political situation in the world depends on its solution.

19 July 1985

Political Implications of Plans

[Zorin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, now let us look at this problem from a political point of view. Nikolay Fedorovich discussed the military aspect.

[Shishlin] Well, first of all, I would like to agree with Nikolay Fedorovich that there are indeed more weapons, but less security; even the United States has less security. Frankly, the political consequences of this military-strategic parity, and not only of military-strategic parity, but of the development of the world situation during the 1980's, the first half of the 1980's, generally convince one that what was contemplated in the United States, what was planned in Washington, did not turn out.

Let us consider the aims the United States set for itself. First of all, it undoubtedly figured that by building up its arms, by realizing a kind of forceful pressure over the whole sphere of world politics, it would weaken the international position of the world socialist system and put pressure on socialism. It failed to do this. It failed, not only because the socialist countries did not surrender a single position; it failed on the broadest strategic count.

U.S.-NATO Relations

Of course, far from everything is smooth and unclouded in relations between the United States and its partners, including its NATO partners. The United States undoubtedly would like, as a minimum, to monopolize the conduct of affairs in the framework of East-West relations, and interrupt, or emasculate, the dialogue between East and West. This did not happen, and the best proof of this was the interesting talks held over recent months in Moscow.

I have in mind, in particular, the talks with Willy Brandt. I would generally like to point out that interesting and fascinating prospects are opening up in augmenting and enriching cooperation with the socialists and social democrats in those things relating to consolidating peace. I have in mind the talks with Italian Prime Minister Craxi; the entire busy diplomatic calendar outlined for 1985. Of course, I would include the interesting visits of our parliamentary delegations to various countries.

In other words, we can state that, in fact, this is not some sort of uncoordinated series of events simply coming together; we are talking about the emergence of a trend, a positive trend. We are talking about the fact that there is a common interest, both among the socialist and the capitalist states. This interest lies in strengthening peace, in normalizing the international situation, and this truly has prospects.

In short, according to a strategic count, we have the right to assert that U.S. policy, and the precepts adopted during the present U.S. President's first term in the White House are getting nowhere. The policy has indeed become more aggressive, malicious, and harsh, but not more effective.

U.S.-Soviet Parity

[Zorin] Nikolay Fedorovich, I would like to return to one of the circumstances associated with what you said. You talked about a balance, an equilibrium, of forces. However, there are letters from our television viewers in Studio 9 mail asking: What is balance? What is equilibrium of forces....

[Chervov, interrupting] Parity.

[Zorin] Yes, parity...

[Shishlin, interrupting] How does it take shape?

[Zorin] How it takes shape, and how it looks from today's viewpoint; I ask you to answer these questions.

[Chervov] If one consults a dictionary, the word parity means equality, and the word balance means equilibrium, or evenness. These terms are used in military affairs in assessing the correlation of military forces. The assessment of military forces is, of course, not simply comparing bare figures. It is, primarily, taking into account all factors in the strategic situation. This is, strictly speaking, recorded in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement of 1979.

The main thing in assessing the capabilities of the U.S. and Soviet Armed Forces is their nuclear might, primarily strategic nuclear forces. It would be wrong to approach their assessment mechanically, without taking into account other factors in the strategic situation, for instance, the different position, geographical position, of the two countries. The Soviet Union is forced to ensure military balance, not only in Europe, but also on our southern and eastern borders. The United States does not need to do this.

For the same reason, all U.S. forward-based nuclear arms, particularly intermediate-range nuclear weapons -- Pershing and cruise missiles -- are strategic weapons in relation to us. They are able to reach our territory, and are capable of changing the strategic situation, and therefore we must consider them as strategic weapons in relation to the Soviet Union. The principle, the observation of the principle of equality and equal security is possible only taking into account U.S. forward-based nuclear arms, large numbers of which are deployed around the Soviet Union.

It is necessary, in calculating military forces, to bear in mind another principle, which the United States and the Soviet Union were guided by in the 1970's, and which we are invariably guided by now. This principle consists of the following: The comparison and maintenance of the military balance between strategic forces must be maintained between the United States and the Soviet Union, which do not have such strategic arms.

In all other forces and weapons a military balance must be maintained between the NATO bloc and the Warsaw Treaty, including nuclear arms, and primarily in intermediate-range nuclear arms; specifically, between, on one side the Soviet Union, and on the other the United States, Britain, and France; in other words, between states having these nuclear weapons.

The United States would now like to change this principle, and compare only U.S. missiles and Soviet intermediate-range missiles. However, this is a false equality. There is no equality in Europe without taking into account British and French missiles.

[Shishlin] Other categories of arms should probably be taken into account.

[Chervov] Yes, quite right. By taking into account other categories of arms, particularly nuclear arms, one should compare states having these weapons.

Assessing the military balance is not an easy task. However, despite the difficulties, the conclusion reached by the leaders of many leading states on this question is unanimous. Currently, an approximate military-strategic balance exists between the United States and the Soviet Union, and between the NATO bloc and the Warsaw Treaty.

How do the trends look concretely? If one takes strategic arms, the existence of a balance in strategic arms between the USSR and the United States was repeatedly checked during the preparation of the SALT II treaty. We have shown it on a picture for television viewers. It is now officially recognized by both sides.

Today, it is confirmed by many competent organizations in the West, including in the United States. Concerning intermediate-range nuclear arms, the United States alleges that the Soviet Union has a superiority, and is quoting ratios of 10 to 1, 6 to 1, but all that is not true. Today, the NATO countries have an advantage. I have shown figures on the screen so the viewers can see the real correlation in intermediate-range nuclear arms. The advantage is with NATO, both in carrier rockets and aircraft, and in the number of nuclear warheads. The Soviet Union has 850 carrier rockets today, and about 2,000 nuclear warheads; NATO, 990 carrier rockets, and about 3,000 nuclear warheads. Despite this, the Soviet Union has unilaterally halted until November of this year the deployment of intermediate-range weapons and the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe, while the United States continues to deploy Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe...

[Shishlin, interrupting] It seems that they want to deploy all the Pershings this year.

[Chervov] Things are going that way.

[Zorin] Will this not upset the balance, Nikolay Fedorovich?

[Chervov] Yes, it will. Already it is tilted to NATO. If they continue to deploy Pershing and cruise missiles, of course the balance will be upset. Therefore, obviously the Soviet Union will adopt appropriate measures. Our moratorium has been set until the month of November. In the West, they deliberately distort the true picture of the correlation of forces in intermediate-range nuclear arms. The NATO side is not counting the British and French missiles, as if they were somewhere on the moon and did not affect the balance of forces. U.S. carrier aircraft are not counted. In brief, the total balance sheet does not include 450 weapons carriers and over 1,500 nuclear warheads. For the Soviet Union, they count all the arms, including those located in the east of the country, which have no relation at all to the European balance sheet.

There is an approximate military parity in conventional armed forces between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. The picture here is as follows: The NATO bloc surpasses the Warsaw Pact in the total number of personnel, the number of combat-ready divisions, and antitank weapons. It has an approximately equal amount of artillery and armored vehicles. NATO concedes slightly to the Warsaw Pact in the number of tactical aircraft. On the whole, there is an approximate parity in conventional arms. The lie being spread in the West concerning Soviet military superiority is an attempt to conceal and justify the U.S. and NATO bid for military superiority. No efforts on either side to achieve an advantage now will be crowned with success. The other side will simply not allow it.

Economic Balance

[Zorin] In connection with what you are talking about, Nikolay Fedorovich, attempts have been made in past years to achieve superiority, to upset the balance, in the economic field also. Ideas have been expressed fairly openly and loudly in Washington about imposing an arms race on the Soviet Union that is incompatible with its economy, about disorganizing the Soviet economy, and thus upsetting the balance on this side, and achieving an advantage. In this connection, the reaction, especially that of Washington, to statements by Comrade Gorbachev at the April CPSU Central Committee Plenum and the conference devoted to the acceleration of scientific-technical progress is noteworthy. Attention was focused on two points; firstly, that they are very serious and far-reaching plans, which will considerably increase the economic potential of the Soviet Union. This is met with visible nervousness. There is also another point. In the opinion of serious observers, these Soviet plans show that all attempts to upset the economic balance through economic subversion have also failed, because the very fact that the submission of the serious plans we are talking about indicate that the Soviet leadership begins with a healthy economy, uses the healthy foundations of that Soviet economy, and, consequently, everything done during these years to undermine it has proved bankrupt. We have spoken about attempts to upset the strategic parity, about this not succeeding. What is your opinion of its political significance?

[Shishlin] The political significance is, of course, tremendous, simply tremendous. First of all, there is the possibility of engaging in constructive affairs, the possibility of peaceful labor for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Then, the political consequences of an approximate military strategic parity mean the narrowing of the field of action for plunder, the policy of strength, the imperialist policy. Under conditions of military-strategic parity, imperialism is forced to act with caution. I think that military-strategic parity is precisely the basis, the foundation for attempting the search for fruitful decisions, attempting to find logical compromises for lowering the level of military confrontation. It is precisely military-strategic parity that has raised the principle of equality and equal security for the sides, and makes it possible, I repeat, to find logical compromise and achieve a considerable lowering of the level of confrontation, and of the arms race.

U.S. Claims of USSR Violations

[Zorin] One must say that despite the failure we are discussing of the attempts to upset the balance in its favor in recent years, the current Washington leadership continues to act in the same direction, and in the same spirit.

However, insofar as this policy is unpopular, Washington is trying to muddy the waters, so to speak, and to confuse the issue by talk; in particular it attempts to justify this line by claiming that the Soviet Union is violating the most important international agreements, particularly the SATL II and the 1972 ABM treaties. This has enjoyed very wide currency. Moreover, these versions are advanced in Washington at the highest level.

Nikolay Fedorovich, I want to ask you, as a representative of the USSR General Staff, to answer the questions connected with these versions.

[Chervov] All the U.S. Administration's insinuations concerning the Soviet Union's so-called violations of its SALT II treaty obligations are absolutely unfounded. The Soviet Union approaches the fulfillment of the obligations it has undertaken with great responsibility and fulfills them precisely. The United States has no facts whatsoever about the Soviet Union's violation of obligations.

In the attempt to accuse us, the U.S. side often reaches the point of absurdity. For instance, it maintains that the Soviet Union encodes certain telemetric information during missile tests which it supposedly needs for monitoring the fulfillment of the SALT II treaty. The Soviet Union does not encode information necessary for monitoring the SALT II treaty. Displaying goodwill, with the aim of solving the question, we proposed that the United States name the parameters that in their opinion should not be encoded. The United States refuses to do this. This indicates how farfetched the claim is.

Here is a second example: The United States maintains that the Soviet Union has supposedly developed a second and new type of ICBM, the SS-25 missile. However, the White House knows well that no second new type of Soviet strategic missile exists. What is passed off as a new missile is an old one, the SS-13, which we are now modernizing, in strict accordance with all the provisions of the SALT II treaty. References by Washington to this missile are being made to reserve for itself the right to create another strategic missile, the Midgetman, along with the MX ICBM.

Generally, it is worth asking, worth posing the question: Why does Washington resort to false and farfetched accusations? This is done with one aim: to justify its militaristic course before the public and to shift responsibility to the Soviet Union for U.S. actions to destroy the treaty system; it is being done, as they say, to pass the buck. The current administration called the SALT II treaty fatally flawed from its first day in power. This treaty has constantly annoyed the White House because it secures strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States. However, it could not reject the treaty immediately. That would mean exposing itself before the whole world. Therefore, the White House chose the path of casting aside the provisions of the treaty interfering with the fulfillment of their military programs.

[Shishlin] Pardon me for interrupting. Nikolay Fedorovich, generally I would say that all this waste of time surrounding the SALT II treaty that Washington started appears to be a requisition for new U.S. arms. Their version of our violation of the treaty is advanced to justify their own course.

U.S. 'Violations' Noted

[Chervov] Quite right. Creeping out of the treaty, the administration leaves behind a long trail of the crudest violations. I shall enumerate them briefly: In the beginning, it generally gave up on ratifying the treaty. Then it refused to leave in force the protocol to it, which is an integral part of the treaty. Abandoning the protocol, it gave the green light to another channel in the arms race: the creation of many thousands of cruise missiles.

A serious blow was thereby inflicted on strategic arms limitation. Afterwards, the administration began to openly bypass the treaty, particularly Articles 12 and 13, by deploying its Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe, trying to alter the strategic parity that the sides had agreed to maintain.

The United States rejected the principle of equality and equal security, which is recorded in the SALT II treaty. In defiance of Article 1 of the treaty, they are displaying no restraint in the creation of new types of strategic arms. Here, the decision to create a second new type of strategic missile, the Midgetman, is a most crude violation.

The United States is violating a number of other provisions of the treaty. For instance, it camouflaged ICBM launchers, hindering the Soviet Union's monitoring of them.

All these violations are the reason for the United States consciously moving to the breakdown of the SALT II treaty, and possibly the talks in Geneva, hoping to shift the blame for this onto the Soviet Union and clear the way for the arms race.

As for the ABM Treaty. The White House is following a line aimed at undermining it. "Star wars" and the ABM Treaty are incompatible. They are poles apart. It is a question of either/or. And President Reagan's SDI is a large mine under the ABM Treaty.

If the United States wrecks this treaty, then all the nuclear arms talks will have no meaning. The process of strategic arms limitation will be wrecked.

Geneva Talks

[Zorin] Nikolay Fedorovich has referred to the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva, and I think that we should, however, briefly tackle this in the context of our discussion...

[Shishlin, interrupting] We do not have to wait long for the end of the second round of talks. A recess in the talks will begin on 16 July. Our viewers know that these talks are being held behind closed doors, and naturally what is taking place directly at the conference table is known only to those holding the talks. But the U.S. line is far from a sincere interest in a reasonable compromise, and this has become very clear. You can talk about it unambiguously. This is being mentioned by Washington officials, including Keyworth, science adviser to the President. He says frankly that one should not expect that any results will be obtained in Geneva this year. Here is another view on the future of the talks, which are important, crucial, and vitally necessary both for us and the United States, and not only for the United States and us. More precisely, U.S. Vice President Bush is now in Europe. He is touring several countries -- Italy, the FRG, Belgium, France, Britain, and Switzerland, where the Soviet-U.S. talks are now being held. Unfortunately, the point is not about Americans' coordinating some of their new initiatives at the talks for the purpose of submitting them for study by the Soviet side. No. Bush continues to use all his efforts, in accordance with White House directives, at getting the partners involved in the implementation of the "star wars" plans.

Regional Conflicts

There is one more point. While talking about the fate of the Geneva talks, which the Soviet Union is approaching them in a most responsible and serious manner, one must not overlook the general world situation nor the general development of international affairs.

The Geneva talks are not isolated from the world process, including world crisis situations, from the state of affairs in so-called hot spots. They have not become colder; these hot spots have not cooled down.

[Chervov] From the military point of view, it would be very dangerous to view these regional conflicts only as local. In present day conditions, they can always lead to a world war. First of all, in local conflicts there is conflict between the interests of many states of the world, including the United States and the Soviet Union. Taking into consideration that these conflicts occur against the background of mountains of stockpiled arms, all these arsenals may be put to use at any moment. Secondly, the local conflicts lead to an intensification of the arms race. Many countries already possess the most modern weapons. The United States is arming Pakistan, Israel, South Africa, and Middle East countries with modern weapons systems. Some countries are close to creating their own nuclear weapons, and some of these most probably have secretly produced nuclear arms. That is why local conflicts are real sources of nuclear war. The main cause of these local conflicts, I would like to emphasize, is the hegemonist policy of the United States and its aspiration is to remake the world according to its fashion, remake it according to its design. It is precisely Washington's interference in other states' affairs, its aspiration to create military bases throughout the entire world, that lead to crisis situations.

Change in U.S. Policy

Of course these circumstances, Valentin Sergeyevich -- returning to your question about the fate of the Geneva talks -- also influence the course of the Geneva talks and Soviet-U.S. relations as a whole, and without current corrections to the U.S. position, it is difficult to count on a dynamic and productive outcome for these Geneva talks.

[Zorin] Now, if we talk about the Geneva talks, and what you have said about brakes, the impression is created, if we analyze Washington's policy in the past 5 to 6 months, that we are dealing with a new zig-zag. Now, everyone recalls that when the current administration began its activities, it demonstrated a harshness, a political harshness in relation to the Soviet Union, verbally as well; the evil empire and crusades were mentioned. Then, a little over a year ago, Washington's tone changed abruptly. It stopped talking about the evil empire, backed off from this harsh rhetoric and, on the contrary, began assuring everybody of their peaceableness.

This zig-zag came to an end after the presidential elections, which points to the political morals of bourgeois politicians. Now a new turn, a return to harsh rhetoric, and a policy of implementing steps which continue to supercharge the situation. This is an obvious political zig-zag occurring of late; besides, I have mentioned one of the reasons for this zig-zag -- the elections -- but it seems there is more to it than that.

Extreme power is being acquired in Washington by circles particularly closely associated with the arms race, and judging from everything, there is a growing inclination in the White House to heed the advice and directions coming from precisely these circles.

[Shishlin] Well, generally, Valentin Sergeyevich, this kind of military pepper is in vogue in Washington, as far as the preparation of political dishes is concerned, and it is clear that they want to keep the United States and international relations in heated conditions.

Nevertheless, it is very important that the world political climate is not formed only in Washington, or so much by Washington. We spoke of this when, at the beginning of our discussion, we dwelt on the topic of the political and strategic situation as a whole. Generally, the dynamics of the development of events here is far from being positive for the United States.

Soviet Policy

Now, you have already mentioned that, at the end of June, the 40th anniversary of the signing of the UN Charter was observed. Of course, the lesson of that time, and of the past decades, a great lesson, lies in the fact that there is, and can be, a common denominator among countries belonging to different social systems, more precisely, an interest in preserving peace and development of peaceful cooperation. Has this common interest, this common denominator disappeared? Has it been eroded by the passage of time? Unequivocally not.

A difficult and complicated struggle is now under way for the creation of conditions and the creation of prerequisites that would permit realization of a turn for the better. In this, Soviet foreign policy has utterly clear guidelines. We truly support a revival of detente, a revival of confidence, and the establishment of a durable and firm peace.

I would like to cite what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said at the Central Committee April Plenum. He said: We firmly support the revival of the process of detente. But this does not mean a simple return to what was achieved in the 1970's.

It is necessary to strive for much more. From our point of view, detente is not the ultimate aim of politics; it is essential, but it is only a transitional stage from a world encumbered with weapons to a reliable and universal system of international security.

Now, this policy, an active policy, is also undoubtedly a prospective policy.

[Zorin] Well, our time has run out. It remains for me to thank you for participating in our discussion. Obviously, we did not have the opportunity to deal with all the questions, but we are not discussing these questions for the last time. Thank you, comrade television viewers, for your attention. Thank you. All the best to you.

CSO: 5200/1296

GENERAL

SOVIET PREMIER, FINNISH PRESIDENT DISCUSS CDE, NORDIC NFZ

Hold Talks

LD180954 Moscow TASS in English 0931 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Kostomuksha (Karelia) June 18 TASS--Nikolay Tikhonov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, today had here a conversation with Mauno Koivisto, president of the Finnish Republic, who had arrived in Kostomuksha at the invitation of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Government.

The Soviet head of government conveyed to the Finnish president friendly greetings and best wishes from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Mauno Koivisto asked to convey to Mikhail Gorbachev his cordial wishes.

The conversation, which passed in a friendly atmosphere, centered on questions of Soviet-Finnish relations and on some outstanding international problems of mutual interest. Nikolay Tikhonov and Mauno Koivisto noted with satisfaction that relations between the USSR and Finland continued to develop steadily and progressively, in the spirit of the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance. The sides reiterated the intention of the two countries to continue unswervingly the course of strengthening friendship and trust and to preserve and replenish everything positive in Soviet-Finnish relations, which had become a model of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

Exchanging opinions on international problems, the sides stressed the need to perseveringly work for concrete agreements on the prevention of the militarisation of space and on ending the race in nuclear missiles and other armaments on earth. The implementation of the Soviet proposal to establish a comprehensive moratorium on nuclear and space weapons could become an effective step on this road. The Soviet side reiterated its support for Finland's proposal on the establishment of a nuclear weapon-free zone in the north of Europe.

Advocating the revival of detente, stronger peace and security and more extensive cooperation in Europe, the Soviet Union and Finland think it very important to successfully complete the Stockholm Conference on Confidence and Security Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe.

The hope was expressed in connection with the 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the European Conference, which would be marked in Helsinki this summer, that all the participating countries would reiterate their commitment to that historical document and their resolve to contribute to the practical implementation of all of its principles and provisions.

Helsinki Report on Talks

LD181715 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 1500 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] President Mauno Koivisto and Soviet Premier Nikolay Tikhonov have had talks today in Soviet Karelia in connection with the inauguration of the second and third stages of the Kostamus mining combine. It was noted in the talks that the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union are still developing steadfastly. It was also noted that favoring the economic relations and keeping the level of trade high formed the foundation for the good neighborly relations between the countries. Among the international issues, Koivisto and Tikhonov discussed armament, the proposal for a Nordic nuclear weapons-free zone and the possibilities of detente. The two sides announced that they thought it very important that the Stockholm disarmament conference is brought to a successful conclusion.

At the same time the hope was expressed that all the participants in the tenth anniversary meeting of the CSCE to be held in Helsinki at the turn of July-August would promise to observe the principles of the Helsinki CSCE meeting.

Tikhonov Addresses Meeting

PM191523 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by TASS special correspondents A. Belikov and V. Zlobin on address by N.A. Tikhonov at 18 June meeting to mark completion of the construction of the Kostomuksha mining and enrichment combine under general heading: "USSR-Finland: Goodneighborliness and Cooperation"]

[Excerpts] Kostomuksha (Karelian ASSR), 18 Jun--In Kostomuksha the head of the Soviet Government and the Finnish president took part in a meeting to mark the completion of the construction of the mining and enrichment combine.

N.A. Tikhonov delivered a speech at the meeting.

N.A. Tikhonov's Speech

In brief, we have grounds for looking into the future of Soviet-Finnish relations with sufficient optimism. Their prospects and peace on the border between the USSR and Finland are reliably safeguarded. Cooperation between our countries and the consolidation of friendship and trust serve the cause of peace and the improvement of the international situation.

We are in favor of the foundations of peace, security, and cooperation in Europe not being undermined but strengthened and we know that Finland's policy is devoted to lofty aims. It is Europe which can and must play an active part in returning international

relations from confrontation and military antagonism to detente and eliminating the threat of war. We firmly believe that there are real preconditions for curbing the forces of militarism and war. The conviction that a world without wars, without weapons, is attainable in practice is strengthening in the consciousness of millions of people.

The time has come to embark in earnest, in a businesslike manner, at the Stockholm Conference on the coordination of major political confidence-building measures which would be combined with mutually acceptable measures in the military field. We are in favor of an international commitment on the nonuse of military force acquiring due weight and authority so that it may be given specific content with regard to the European situation.

The 10th anniversary of the signing of the Final Act of the all-European conference could be an important action on the path of restoring and intensifying detente. We hope that in Helsinki in 6 weeks the states which signed that historic document will reaffirm their political will to promote peace, security, justice, cooperation, and rapprochement among the peoples in Europe and will, in other words, confirm their loyalty to the "Helsinki spirit."

Much can also be done to benefit European peace and cooperation in northern Europe. The retention of this region outside the centers of international tension and the implementation of constructive initiatives put forward by Finland are particularly topical now.

The main line of the Soviet state's foreign policy activity has been, is, and will be the struggle for peace, the struggle to ensure conditions for constructive activity for our people and the peoples of the whole world. This line was convincingly confirmed at the CPSU Central Committee Extraordinary March and April Plenums. It was with these thoughts that the Soviet people celebrated the 40th anniversary of the great victory over Hitler's fascism and it is with these thoughts that we are coming to our party's 27th congress.

In the noble matter of safeguarding peace, halting the arms race, and strengthening peaceful cooperation, N.A. Tikhonov stressed in conclusion, we are prepared to continue to collaborate with our good neighbor Finland.

This will cement our friendship still more powerfully and will reflect even more graphically the coincidence of the long-term national interest of the Soviet and Finnish peoples.

CSO: 5200/1295

GENERAL

GORBACHEV DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES WITH VIETNAMESE LEADER

PRAVDA Reports Talks

PM011119 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 85 First Edition p 1

["In the Atmosphere of Friendship and Cordiality"]

[Excerpts] Talks were held in the Kremlin on 28 June between the party and government delegation of the USSR headed by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and the party and government delegation of Vietnam headed by General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Le Duan.

The talks were attended from the Soviet side by the member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Tikhanov; member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Andrey Gromyko; member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Konstantin Rusakov; member of the CPSU Central Committee, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Nikolay Talyzin and the alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Ambassador to Vietnam Boris Chaplin.

On the Vietnamese side the talks were attended by member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPV, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party Vo Chi Cong; member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Party, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam To Huu; member of the Central Committee of the party, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of Vietnam Tran Quynh; member of the Central Committee of the party, head of the Foreign Relations Department of the Central Committee of the CPV Vu Quang and the member of the Central Committee of the party, Ambassador of Vietnam to the USSR Dinh Nho Liem.

The Soviet and Vietnamese delegations strongly denounced the policy pursued by the reactionary circles of imperialism headed by the U.S. which is aimed at upsetting the military-strategic balance, at achieving military superiority over the USSR, over the Warsaw Treaty member states, by means of whipping up the arms race on the earth and spreading it to outer space, as well as the interference in the internal affairs of sovereign countries.

Participants in the talks unanimously stressed that today, when the international situation was characterized by dangerous tension, unity and cohesion of countries of the socialist community and the coordinated actions of all the forces interested in the preservation and consolidation of peace acquired special importance.

The Vietnamese delegation expressed full support for the Leninist foreign policy of the USSR, for its peaceful initiatives aimed at the prevention of a nuclear catastrophe and of the militarization of outer space, as well as at the improvement of the political climate in the world.

The USSR and Vietnam strongly denounced Washington's aggressive plans to turn the Asian-Pacific region into another arena of military-political confrontation with socialist countries. They reiterated their allegiance to the idea of turning Asia into a zone of peace and equitable cooperation. The sides went on record in favour of stepping up the search for ways to resolve problems connected with ensuring peace and security on the Asian continent.

Gorbachev on INF in Europe, Asia

LD281614 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 28 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Moscow June 28 TASS--The CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the USSR gave a dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace today in honor of a party and government delegation from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam led by Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made the following speech at the dinner:

Dear Comrade Le Duan, Dear Vietnamese Friends, Comrades. It is with keen satisfaction that we welcome the visit to our country of a party and government delegation from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam led by Comrade Le Duan, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPV. We are convinced that the visit will mark another important step in the all-round development and enhancement of Soviet-Vietnamese brotherhood and cooperation.

The talks confirmed that the fraternal links of the Soviet Union and Vietnam rest on the firm, tested foundation of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism and meet the fundamental interests and aspirations of our peoples, the interests of world peace.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and other states of the socialist community, their ideas and proposals, the broad package of their peace initiatives have been dictated by concern for preserving peace on earth. Peaceful coexistence, the equal and dependable security of the sides, the lowering of the levels of military confrontation and world military-political tension as a whole, and the prevention of hegemonism in any form - this is what we want, what we are seeking to ensure.

A big contribution to improving the state of things in the world would undoubtedly be made if in its largest and most populous part, namely Asia and the Pacific basin, the political awareness of the acute need to move towards normalizing the situation prevailed. So far, regrettably, it hasn't.

1:

One cannot but see that the United States of late has visibly stepped up its military preparations in that region. It is encouraging revanchist trends in the policy of the ruling quarters of Japan and pressing on with the forging of a militarist alliance of Washington, Tokyo and Seoul.

Washington is busy trying to enlist the countries of the region in furthering its global military-political plans, including the notorious "Pacific doctrine," it is interfering in the affairs of sovereign nations and obstructing the settlement of problems by way of talks. The edge of this policy is directed against the Soviet Union, Vietnam and other socialist states in Asia, against Afghanistan and Kampuchea. But by its very essence it threatens all nations in the Asian-Pacific region.

Naturally enough, such peace-endangering actions cannot but prompt the concern of the countries of the region and sometimes legitimate counter-measures.

The policy of the Soviet Union meets the nations' desire for peace and cooperation. We stand for eliminating the seats of conflict and counter the imperialist policy leading to a further dangerous destabilization of the situation.

Our country is prepared resolutely to cut the knots which have not been tied by us. For example, we are for reducing the level of confrontation in medium-range nuclear systems. We have declared on more than one occasion that should corresponding agreement be reached in Europe, we shall scrap the number of medium-range missiles in the European part of the country, on which the agreement will have been reached.

We have also stated our consent to freezing the number of missiles in the Asian part of the Soviet Union, of course, on condition that the American side will not take steps towards changing the strategic situation in the region. The Soviet Union would not be against discussing this problem with Asian and Pacific states having similar systems, with a view to limiting and subsequently reducing these systems on, it goes without saying, the basis of reciprocity.

We recently put forward the idea of holding in future a Pan-Asian forum to exchange opinions and jointly look for constructive solutions. The first responses to this proposal have indicated that there is gravitation towards such an exchange of opinions.

Certainly, there are difficulties, as well. Not all like such a vigorous placing of the issue. There are forces which have given a hostile reception to the idea. But we have no lack of good will. Patience and persistence. We urge all interested countries in the continent to display supreme political wisdom and get down in serious [as received] to the fundamental problems of strengthening peace and security.

We are convinced that Asia can and should become a continent of peace and good-neighbornliness. It is only in conditions of genuine peace and stability that the countries of the region can successfully accomplish the difficult task of social and economic development facing them.

This goal is served by the concrete proposals of the Soviet Union, the countries of Indochina and other socialist countries, including the proposals for working out confidence-building measures in the Far East and concluding a convention of mutual non-aggression and non-use of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific. The initiatives of India and a number of other non-aligned countries go in the same direction as these efforts.

Joint Declaration

PM291736 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Excerpts] An SRV party-government delegation headed by Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee, paid an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union 26 June through 1 July 1985 at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Soviet Government.

A cordial reception was given to fraternal Vietnam's emissaries in the Soviet Union and their meetings with party and state figures and representatives of the Soviet public were a vivid demonstration of the militant solidarity and inviolable friendship and cohesion between the CPSU and the CPV and between the peoples of the USSR and Vietnam.

During the visit talks were held between a Soviet party-government delegation headed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the SRV party-government delegation headed by Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee.

The following took part in the talks:

On the Soviet side -- M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and USSR foreign minister; N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; K.V. Rusakov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; N.V. Talyzin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and B.N. Chaplin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR ambassador to the SRV.

On the Vietnamese side -- Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee; Vo Chi Cong, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPV Central Committee; To Huu, member of the CPV Central Committee and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Tran Quynh, member of the CPV Central Committee and vice chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers; Vu Kuang, member of the CPV Central Committee and director of the CPV Central Committee Foreign Relations Department; and Dinh Nho Lien, member of the CPV Central Committee and SRV ambassador to the USSR.

A separate conversation was also held between M.S. Gorbachev and Le Duan.

The talks and conversations took place in a friendly, cordial atmosphere reflecting the fraternal nature of Soviet-Vietnamese relations and confirmed the complete unity of the sides' positions on all the questions discussed.

I. The Soviet and Vietnamese leaders exchanged information on progress in fulfilling the socioeconomic tasks set in the decisions of the congresses of the two fraternal parties and on the preparations that have begun in the Soviet Union and Vietnam for the 27th CPSU Congress and the 6th CPV Congress.

II. During the exchange of opinions on topical questions of the international situation and of the world communist, workers, and national liberation movement, the sides noted the high level of collaboration between the Soviet Union and the SRV in the foreign policy sphere and advocated the further close coordination of the two countries' efforts in the interests of peace and socialism.

The Soviet and Vietnamese delegations expressed a united assessment of the present complex international situation and pointed to the danger of the policy of reactionary imperialist circles, headed by the United States, which have decided to smash the prevailing strategic military equilibrium in the world and to extend the arms race to space, and who are trying to dictate their will to sovereign states, and are crudely interfering in their internal affairs. There is now no more important and urgent task than to prevent the world from sliding toward nuclear disaster and to preserve peace on earth.

Both sides stressed the large-scale and constructive nature of the socialist states' initiatives, including those regarding the adoption by all the nuclear powers, following the USSR's example, of a commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, the freezing of nuclear potentials, the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, and the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace between the Warsaw Pact states and the NATO countries and between all participants in the all-European conference.

The Vietnamese side expressed total support for the Soviet Union's principled position at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva and expressed the conviction that the United States' joining in the moratorium that the USSR has declared for the entire duration of the Geneva talks on the creation, including scientific research work, testing, and deployment of offensive space armaments would be of great importance for the success of these talks.

Both sides reaffirmed their commitment to the idea of transforming Asia into a zone of peace and equal cooperation and advocated accelerating the quest for constructive and mutually acceptable ways to solve the problems of ensuring peace and security on the continent. These aims, the sides are convinced, can be achieved through the united efforts of all Asian states on the basis of a comprehensive approach, via bilateral and multilateral talks and exchanges of opinions. The achievement of these aims would be effectively promoted by implementation of the socialist states' well-known proposals, including those on implementing confidence-building measures in the Far East, concluding a convention on mutual nonaggression and the nonuse of force in relations between Asian and Pacific states, and transforming the Indian Ocean into a peace zone and convening an international conference on this question no later than the first half of 1986, as determined by the 39th UN General Assembly session. In the sides' opinion, the holding in the future of an all-Asian forum in order to examine the whole complex of questions relating to ensuring security on the continent would be of great significance.

The Soviet Union and Vietnam noted the increasing role of the Nonaligned Movement in the struggle for peace, against the arms race, and for the restructuring of international economic relations on a just and democratic basis. The sides greatly appreciate India's important contribution to the struggle to strengthen peace and security, remove the threat of nuclear war, and bring about the relaxation of international tension and that country's constructive role in consolidating the unity and enhancing the prestige of the Nonaligned Movement in world affairs.

M. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee

Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV

CSO: 5200/1298

GENERAL

USSR: ARMS ISSUES HIGHLIGHTED ON UN ANNIVERSARY

PRAVDA Editorial

PM251601 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Defend Peace!"]

[Text] Our people have been living under a peaceful sky for more than 40 years. That is to the credit of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, which bear aloft the Leninist banner of peace. Our country's working people are working intensively to put into practice the creative plans drawn up by the party. Soviet people see their implementation as a very important guarantee of nipping in the bud the dangerous designs of imperialism's aggressive forces and of preserving and strengthening universal peace.

Aware of their responsibility for the future of the world and always remembering the severe lessons of the last war, the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states are taking the necessary measures to ensure that the peaceful, creative labor of the builders of socialism and communism are reliably protected from any encroachments by the imperialists. The friendship of the socialist countries is a very great gain for the peoples; it augments their forces and gives them confidence in the future. It is our common patriotic and international duty to strengthen this friendship in every way.

Peace will be lasting when the highest, universal laws of international relations are those of peaceful, constructive coexistence and equal, mutually advantageous cooperation between states regardless of their social system. That is why the CPSU and the Soviet state persistently advocate correct [korrektnyy] relations between states, based on strict respect for international law.

The UN Charter was signed 40 years ago, 26 June 1945. To live together in peace with one another as good neighbors--that is one of the most important principles which the states joining the organization pledged to follow--and today there are 159 of them. This principle reflects the idea of the need for peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems which the Land of the Soviets has consistently upheld since the first days of its existence.

The UN Charter was elaborated as a result of the people's victory over fascism. It reflects a lesson of paramount importance drawn by the peoples from past

experience: It is necessary to fight against war together, and before its flames flare up. "To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war:-- that is how the UN Charter formulates its main task.

The Soviet Union, which is a committed opponent of the resolution of international disputes by means of force, has always attached great significance to the United Nations as an effective instrument for peace. Our country is prepared to take more and more new steps to ensure that the just, democratic principles on which the United Nations is founded become firmly established in the practice of international relations. There has been no session of the UN General Assembly or the community's working organs at which the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have not put forward concrete proposals aimed at solving urgent international problems in a way which meets the peoples' vital interests.

The socialist policy of peace is a graphic example of the persistent, consistent implementation of the noble principles of the UN Charter. The USSR and the other socialist community countries counterpose to the U.S. and NATO line of the arms race constructive initiatives and concrete, realistic proposals aimed at ending the stockpiling of weapons and bringing about a sharp arms reduction and disarmament. The numerous proposals put forward by the Soviet Union include initiatives concerning the nonmilitarization of space, and practical proposals on reducing nuclear arsenals until they are completely eliminated, on banning chemical weapons, and many others.

Seeking to facilitate the transition to arms reduction, the Soviet Union proposed a freeze on the creation of space strike arms, strategic offensive arms, and medium-range nuclear systems for the duration of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva. By way of setting a good example, the USSR unilaterally halted until November the implementation of the deployment of its own medium-range nuclear systems and other countermeasures in Europe. The peoples are indignant that this initiative was not followed by a corresponding response from the American side. On the contrary, Washington continues to spin the spiral of the arms race.

American militarism is stubbornly trying to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist community and wreck the established military-strategic equilibrium, which hampers the implementation of its aggressive designs. The present Washington administration seeks to undermine and destroy everything positive that was achieved in the sphere of international security by the joint efforts of states and peoples in the seventies.

They are trying to replace detente with confrontation. The militarists are striving to give themselves a completely free hand for an uncontrolled arms race, first and foremost for nuclear arms. Their aim is to explode and destroy the existing accords, especially the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty and the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems, which have hitherto to some degree checked the escalation of rivalry in the strategic arms sphere. Having proclaimed the "star wars" Program, the U.S. militarist circles are setting a course of turning outer space into an arena of death and destruction. They

would like mankind to remain locked in a vicious circle: confrontation--arms race--confrontation.

But the peoples do not intend to reconcile themselves to this prospect. The determination of hundreds of millions of people of good will to preserve and strengthen peace is embodied in the peoples' powerful antiwar, antimissile demonstrations that embrace the whole planet. Joint actions by all antiwar forces regardless of their political or ideological orientation, and above all by the parties and organizations of the working class, are more important than ever before in the present tense situation.

Despite the complexity of the international situation, our country believes that to avert the danger of nuclear war is possible, and to continue the progressive advance toward lasting peace is realistic. It requires a firm political will for peace. The USSR has that will. The Soviet people are filled with unbending determination to greet the forthcoming 27th Congress of the Leninist party with new successes in all salients of the struggle for peace and communism.

Foreign Ministry Meeting

LD241057 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 24 Jun 85

["Meeting at the Press Centre of the Soviet Foreign Ministry" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS -- Since the very establishment of the United Nations, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have been consistently trying to contribute to the United Nations being an efficient tool of ensuring collective security, Vladimir Petrovskiy, a member of the Collegium of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, today said in his address here at a meeting with the heads of the diplomatic missions accredited in the USSR. The meeting was devoted to the 40th anniversary of the signing of the U.N. Charter.

Evaluating the activities of the United Nations, Vladimir Petrovskiy stressed that on the whole the U. N. Charter was effectively promoting realism and responsibility in international affairs. It has stood the test of the time and proved its viability in our rapidly changing world. Immense shifts in the social, political, scientific, technical and economic fields that have taken place since the signing of the charter are just confirming the correctness of the concept of peaceful coexistence and cooperation written into it and are making its implementation the only sensible alternative for mankind.

The spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry noted that the idea of international security formalized in the U.N. Charter was incompatible with the claims that security could be guaranteed by stockpiling weapons and that a way to the elimination of the nuclear threat was offered by the development of attack space weapons. Practice showed that the development and actual use of the first prototypes of nuclear weapons, far from promoting the abolition of conventional weapons, spurred on the race in both nuclear and conventional armaments contrary to the goals of the U.N. Charter. The case with space weapons would likely be the same.

Vladimir Petrovskiy recalled that on the Soviet Union's initiative, the United Nations had approved in recent years declarations on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and on the denunciation of nuclear warfare and resolutions on the usefulness of the renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons by all the nuclear powers, like the USSR did, on freezing and subsequently reducing and eliminating the nuclear arms arsenals and on prohibiting all nuclear testing, on preventing the arms race in space and restricting it on the high seas, on the inadmissibility of the policy of state terrorism, on the abolition of seats of military danger and colonial racist oppression, and on restructuring international economic relations on a fair basis. So it is not because of the imperfection of the U.N. Charter or individual arms of the organization itself that we have to mark the 40th anniversary of the U.N. Charter in the situation of growing worry over the destinies of the world but because of those who are thinking in terms of their imperial past and would not like to revise their policy to fit the existing realities, Vladimir Petrovskiy said.

Non-aligned countries, according to the Soviet spokesman, are an important positive factor contributing to turning the United Nations into a centre coordinating the activities of states. Their position, he stressed, is characterized by a commitment to the goals and principles of the U.N. Charter and by a striving to have them translated into practice.

It is by the joint efforts of the U.N. member-countries, by the strict observance rather than revision of the charter and by implementing the useful resolutions of the organization, primarily its Security Council, that the role of the United Nations as an effective tool of peace can be enhanced.

As for the Soviet Union, Vladimir Petrovskiy said in conclusion, it, as Mikhail Gorbachev stressed, "being opposed in principle to the settlement of contentious issues by force, always attached and continues to attach much importance to the United Nations as an effective tool of peace and is prepared to take fresh steps so that the just democratic principles on which the United Nations was built 40 years ago should be firmly asserted in the practice of international relations."

The activity of the Soviet-U.N. Association was described at the meeting by Academician Georgiy Arbatov, vice-president of that organization.

CSO: 5200/1281

GENERAL

USSR ROUNDTABLE ON IMPORTANCE OF ARMS CONTROL TO EAST-WEST TIES

PM271524 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 26 Jun 85 p 2

[Roundtable feature: "East-West: Civilized Relations. Necessity? Reality? Utopia?"--first paragraph is LITERATURNAYA GAZETA introduction]

[Text] The search for an alternative to the line pursued by the West of confrontation and an arms race is an important goal of the USSR's policy at the present stage. The following "roundtable" between Soviet scientists specializing in international affairs--Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Fedor Mikhaylovich Burlatskiy--is devoted to this problem.

[Text] The search for an alternative to the line pursued by the West of confrontation and an arms race is an important goal of the USSR's policy at the present stage. The following "round table" between Soviet scientists specializing in international affairs -- Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Fedor Mikhaylovich Burlatskiy -- is devoted to this problem.

[Burlatskiy] The fundamental question of present-day world development is, of course, the question of East-West relations, and it is appropriate now to think not only of current problems but of the ultimate foundations of some kind on which relations between socialist and capitalist countries should certainly be based in the nuclear age. Not so long ago M.S. Gorbachev came up with the idea of civilized relations in the world arena. It would be interesting to imagine what this means in practice. What amount of principles, norms, and practical actions does it cover? In other words, what is the "ideal model" for East-West relations?

[Zagladin] The actual problem of civilized relations arose, as I understand it, in connection with the fact that at the current time they are clearly not civilized in nature, and this is linked with the fact that one of the two sides in practice rejects the principles of such relations. The leading capitalist power, the United States, approaches the development of relations between countries and the development of the world as a whole not from the viewpoint of consideration of the real state of affairs, but from the viewpoint of its own egoistic interests and subjective goals.

I recall that after the October Revolution President W. Wilson called for workers' rule in the USSR to be destroyed and in general for this concept to disappear forever. Here there is direct continuity with today, but of course what I have just said certainly does not mean that civilized relations between the two systems are impossible. What is needed for this first and foremost is realism in the approach to the modern world and acceptance of it as it is, and correspondingly, realism in posing your own goals and tasks and assessing your own capabilities in the struggle to achieve your goals.

[Burlatskiy] This, so to speak, is the destructive side of the problem, the things that hinder the establishment of civilized East-West relations. There is also a constructive side: With what interests -- state, national, or class -- do these sorts of relations accord?

[Yakovlev] I think that there are objective grounds for the establishment of civilized relations. Mutual relations between countries with different social systems -- for all the differences existing between them in terms of the social class nature of society, the political system, ideology, and so forth -- can and must be stable, even, and correct in nature. The norm for relations between the two systems must not be confrontation, but peaceful coexistence. This is the only sensible basis for normal mutual relations between the two systems. What alternative is there? Dangerous war brinkmanship with an extreme risk that a universal catastrophe may happen at any moment. Does this really accord with the interests of any country?

[Zagladin] Of course it accords with nobody's interests if you mean the genuine legitimate interests of countries and peoples.

Every country has such interests. These are above all security interests, interests of survival, so as to speak. I think that not only working people but also the bourgeoisie are interested in this. Are Morgans and Rockefellers really unafraid of nuclear fire?

Now all people, at any rate, all civilized people, have come to the conclusion that nuclear war would be fatal for all mankind. The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet, and USSR Council of Ministers appeal states this with utter clarity. Therefore the first principle which must form the foundation of civilized relations is the recognition that war does not ensure anyone's security and cannot solve any problems.

[Burlatskiy] In the twenties and thirties both sides -- capitalism and socialism -- were convinced that war between them was inevitable by virtue of the opposite nature of their systems. But life proved to be more complex. World War II started within the capitalist system, but ultimately the countries that once participated in intervention against the Soviet Union -- Britain, France, and the United States -- were our allies in the common struggle against fascism. That is a practical lesson which history has taught us and which must never be forgotten. Exactly 40 years have passed since the victory and, fortunately, it has been possible to avoid a war, despite the acute confrontation which the West has launched against us from time to time.

But the question is: what specific expression should be given to the formula of civilized relations?

[Yakovlev] Differing viewpoints on this score are expressed among scientists and politicians. But certain imperatives of states' foreign policy behavior within the framework of this model seem, if not obvious, fully suited to discussion. I would cite the following principles to begin with:

The goal of policy with regard to states with a different social system should not be to alter their existing system -- whatever the considerations of a social class, ideological, or political nature motivating this.

The use of force in mutual relations between states must be eschewed once and for all and problems must be resolved by way of talks taking mutual interests into account on the basis of sensible compromises.

It is necessary to abandon once and for all the illusions of acquiring "absolute invulnerability" via a large-scale buildup of military means; the paradox of the nuclear age is that increases in arsenals of mass destruction weapons lead ultimately to reduced, not increased levels of security.

In its activity in the world arena, each state must take account of the legitimate interests of other participants in international life and give the interests of cooperation and simply of maintaining even mutual relations with countries belonging to the opposing social system priority over transient political considerations, let alone ideologically conditioned stereotypes.

That is the minimum with which dialogue could be begun with our partners regarding a code of relations between the two world systems under present conditions.

[Zagladin] I think that ending the arms race is of particular importance. This is now certainly the main thing. The arms race, however it is camouflaged, is essentially preparation for war. True, the race may also serve other goals -- forcing peoples and states into submission without the direct use of force and even attempts to force other countries to capitulate. But this is an absolutely unrealistic approach.

The following paradox can be stated: If it is impossible to win a war, it is also impossible to win the arms race. It leads to deadlock: either the most terrible deadlock -- war -- or another kind of deadlock -- permanent confrontation.

Joint action is needed to strengthen universal security. It only takes one side to quarrel but it takes two sides to organize good relations. I would add here one further principle which is now probably very topical. The edifice of security must be built not only through the joint efforts of states, but by relying on the public, the peoples, and mass movements. Practice shows that to build security contrary to the will of the peoples and the antiwar movements is to build on sand.

[Burlatskiy] I believe that civilized relations are synonymous with active peaceful coexistence. After all, so to speak, a negative or passive coexistence in general took place even during the "cold war" period. Moreover, I think that civilized relations are a step forward even in comparison with the relaxation of international

tension. It is probably a question of a stage of peaceful coexistence which inherits the best things from detente and means considerable progress along the road of joint actions aimed at eliminating the threat of nuclear annihilation, precisely joint rather than separate actions on the part of nation states and alliances. The ultimate goal of civilized relations is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. When we achieved military parity it became clear even to our enemies that these weapons are unusable and therefore militarily senseless. Of course, nuclear weapons are now a means of deterrence [sderzhivaniye]. But who has proved that conventional arms are incapable of fulfilling that function?

Incidentally, the principles we are talking about are by no means a recent invention. Both sides -- east and west -- have already made efforts to formulate some kind of code of conduct in the conditions of the nuclear age. And the documents of the seventies, above all the "basic principles of relations between the USSR and the United States" are of particular value.

So what happened to our partners, why did they backpedal? Does not this call into question the very possibility and reality of civilized relations now and in the foreseeable future? Are they not an illusion, in view of our partners' position?

[Zagladin] I think that the retreat from detente by the United States and its allies is to be explained first and foremost by a struggle between two lines in U.S. policy which has never ended.

At the very start of detente -- at the end of the sixties and the start of the seventies -- a sensible and realistic line held sway in the United States. It was implemented by President R. Nixon and H. Kissinger. They understood and openly formulated the concept that, since equilibrium of military forces exists, there is no option but to organize normal relations with the USSR. Incidentally, M. Kampelman said approximately the same thing in one of his recent publications: Of course it would be better to destroy the Soviet system, but since we would destroy ourselves along with the Russians there is no option but to sit down at the negotiating table with them.

The struggle surrounding this simple dilemma raged constantly, and at that time realism had the upper hand. But at the same time, another line in U.S. policy existed and was even growing stronger, and its representatives were preparing public opinion for a turnaround. Perhaps this will sound unexpected but I think that one of the first acts in this struggle for a turn toward "cold war" was R. Nixon's forced resignation. It was clear that President R. Nixon would not implement this turn.

First, he had linked his name with detente, and this is always of great importance in the United States. Second, he was convinced of the correctness of this course and it was impossible to change his mind. And thus a means was found of getting rid of an inconvenient president. Actions repeatedly used by other presidents -- both before and after Nixon -- were used as the pretext.

Can it really be considered accidental that this happened in the period of preparations for the Helsinki Conference?

[Yakovlev] I would like to add something linked with an analysis of domestic policy, which promoted the formation and success of the "conservative wave" in the United States and a number of other developed capitalist countries -- Britain, the FRG, and Japan.

In my view, this is linked with the rise of a group which could be termed the "new group" in the monopoly bourgeoisie. This section of the bourgeoisie represents new directions in production -- above all military directions -- linked with the technological revolution. And it is having an active influence on the government. It strives to undermine or weaken the long-standing symbiosis between the government and the "old Wall Street bourgeois aristocracy" and mounts its attacks from a conservative standpoint. Put simply, this group demands a redistribution of the state cake to its advantage. These new groups of the bourgeoisie rely politically on small and medium-sized business and on a considerable section of the middle strata, which support a policy of cutting taxes and government spending and hope that unemployment will be limited through an increase in [business] activeness and that opportunities for private enterprise will be expanded.

Under the prevailing conditions, the new business groups have sensed that their time has come. The economic potential amassed by this section of the monopoly bourgeoisie has enabled it, taking advantage of the sociopolitical situation, to stake a claim to a place in the U.S. sociopolitical system and the system of influencing the levers of state power commensurate with its positions in the economy.

Moreover, the right-wingers succeeded in pinning the responsibility for the profound moral and political crisis that had shaken the West on the liberals and left-wingers.

[Burlatskiy] It is obviously possible to note a most curious interweaving of domestic and geopolitical factors.

In the seventies the United States was experiencing a crisis of leadership in the Western World and a crisis of its claims to leadership in the modern world as a whole. To paraphrase Dean Acheson's aphorism, it can be said that the United States had lost an empire and had not yet found a new role. The seventies were the watershed when serious shifts in the correlation of forces took place not only between socialism and capitalism but in the world arena as a whole.

[Zagladin] There is yet another important aspect of the question -- U.S. policy in the developing world. Striving for revenge in the spirit of the "cold war," conservative U.S. forces used events in Angola, then Ethiopia, Zaire, and so forth in attempts to show that the USSR is stepping up its "penetration" of the "third world." But even if you take Western sources it is easy to see for yourself that in all instances where some kind of interference has been ascribed to us our actions have been merely a response and were taken only after someone had already attacked one country or another.

An interesting detail is that the first Cuban advisers went to Angola with the Portuguese Government's permission. We started helping Ethiopia when it was attacked by the Somalis, to whom weapons were being supplied from Egypt and subsequently from U.S. bases. Well, of course, it is said that Afghanistan played a fatal role with regard to detente. But here's what is interesting: when the then U.S. secretary of state was asked whether it was true that events in Afghanistan were the reason for the refusal to ratify the SALT II treaty and for the turnaround in Soviet-U.S. relations, he replied that nothing could be more stupid than that assumption.

[Burlatskiy] Thus we can see that the turn away from detente toward confrontation was no accident, it was linked with the "conservative wave" in the United States and a number of other countries. But there is a question which inevitably arises. Are not our hopes and our struggle for civilized relations illustory, bearing in mind our partners' positions? What in fact are the fundamental political goals of the West, and first and foremost the United States? What do they want? To win a war without a war? To strengthen the West's elite position in the modern world, above all in the sphere of the economy? To achieve military superiority and use it --- how? Perhaps we must simply be patient and wait for a more sober and realistic course to replace the "conservative wave" in the West?

[Yakovlev] I think that in assessing the change in the U.S. political course in the eighties it is important to spotlight the main thing. Namely, Washington's orientation toward the wrecking of parity in the correlation of military forces between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact organization and NATO and the achievement of military superiority for the West. Parity was, essentially, officially confirmed as a result of the signing of the SALT II treaty, each clause and each figure in which was most painstakingly checked and agreed by the supreme political and military authorities of the Soviet Union and the United States over the course of 7 years of talks. As a result the equality of the two countries' strategic arsenals was juridically enshrined.

The events of the eighties showed that the United States and its allies had chosen a quite different path. The former recognitions of the equality of military forces were rejected, forgotten, or declared to be mistaken. And it was a question not of nuances of the Western figures' opinions and assessments, but of a change of political course. It was a change not of rhetoric but of policy.

What is the aim of the United States? Well, it is hard to penetrate the secret plans of the White House and the Pentagon, but I think that the U.S. and NATO military-political strategists proceed on the basis of an extensive collection of goals. These include the desire to ensure a dominant position for imperialism in the modern world, to secure internal changes in the socialist countries in the direction of the restoration of capitalist orders, to undermine the main forces of the world revolutionary process, and to weaken the economic positions of the USSR and the socialist community through an exhausting arms race. At the same time U.S. calculations and plans by no means rule out the direct unleashing of war against the USSR and its allies if the U.S. military-political leadership deems the correlation of forces favorable for such a decision.

[Zagladin] I think that the goal of directly unleashing nuclear war is now hardly part of Western plans. The hope of winning a war without war still exists. To use a billiards term here, they are hoping to pocket not two but three balls at once. First, they want to bring the socialist countries to their knees; second, they want to completely subordinate their allies to them; and third, they want to impose "order" in the developing world and eradicate whatever does not suit the United States.

That is, turn the developing liberated countries into a greater Grenada. That, of course, is unrealistic because it is unattainable, but these goals do exist.

We realize that the United States, which obtains a considerable proportion of its resources through imports, does have its own interests in the "third world." Naturally it is also interested in ensuring that these raw materials and oil, say, are safely transported to its country. But that does not mean that the United States has the right to declare whole regions a zone of its interests regardless of the interests of the countries within these zones. Otherwise scope for conflicts and therefore for a deterioration in the entire international climate will arise.

[Burlatskiy] Let us simplify the question. Can we come to an agreement with Mr R. Reagan on anything essential or must we wait for a different trend to prevail in U.S. policy?

[Zagladin] As for Mr. Reagan, I do not know him personally and therefore cannot say anything on that subject. As for the future, I am nonetheless convinced that the Americans are a nation that possesses common sense. There are, of course, a mass of different people and viewpoints over there, but I would like to hope that a realistic understanding of their own interests would ultimately prevail. But, once again, on what does this depend? On the correlation of forces in the world. First and foremost on the strengthening of socialism and our active policy. And then on a change in the world situation -- in the Asian countries, which are nonetheless traveling the path of independent development, and in Latin America, which is undoubtedly turning into a major political and economic center of the modern world. This deprives the United States of hopes of maintaining its hegemony.

At the risk of seeming paradoxical again, I would not link the normalization of East-West relations with the ebbing of the "conservative wave." Moreover, certain conservative politicians may, under certain conditions, show more inclination for normalization and the development of civilized relations on the international scene than certain liberals. Let us recall Mr R. Nixon once again. Was he a liberal? Certainly not. He was a right-winger who made no secret of his views -- including his anticommunist views. But, I repeat, he was more of a realist than his successors. It is absolutely impossible to rule this out in other cases too. Of course, if truly liberal forces were to come to power in the United States they might be more active in pursuing a civilized policy. But nonetheless it is hardly justified to directly link one thing with the other.

[Burlatskiy] One should probably also take into account such an important factor in world politics as the West European countries' influence. I think that the foundations of detente have persisted on the European Continent, despite the sharp deterioration in the entire international situation. Agreements and accords in the military sphere (ABM, SALT I and II) remain in force, on the whole political contacts between the leaders of the capitalist and socialist European states are quite regular, and numerous trade, economic, scientific, and technical agreements are being successfully implemented. Even in an atmosphere of a sharp international chill nobody in West Europe has ventured or is venturing to issue an open challenge to peaceful coexistence. Moreover, by the mid-eighties understanding of the need to maintain the foundations and further develop the process of detente has deepened in many West European countries.

[Yakovlev] Yes, there is no doubt that a great deal in world politics will depend on what positions the West European countries take on the main international political problems.

The formation of a West European center, whose nucleus is the EEC, and the expansion of its economic and political activity have turned West Europe into a special region in the system of present-day international relations that plays a role comparable to that of the United States in many spheres.

But, unfortunately, it is not always nor on all questions that the constructive principle in the West European states' policy prevails over the negative, confrontational trend, whose intensification has been particularly marked since the end of the seventies. A considerable part of the responsibility for the exacerbation of the international situation is borne by the West European countries participating in NATO.

Furthermore, there are increasing differences of opinion among the countries of this region on a number of fundamental security problems. Thus, the present French leadership, which was the first to oppose the U.S. plans for creating strike space arms, is gradually coming down in favor of detente. At the same time, the FRG, which has followed in the footsteps of U.S. militarist ambitions, is on the extreme wing. True, even the FRG sets considerable store by expanding and intensifying economic ties with the socialist states.

[Zagladin] In general, it must be said that nothing disappears without a trace in history, especially not detente. Detente is often identified with a complex of various measures, but it seems to me that it should be approached more broadly. It is not just a complex of measures, it is a definite stage of development between countries with different social systems, and, as I see it, a stage which is not an ultimate goal but a transitional stage, that is, a transition to normal, stable, and civilized relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence. And this very stage of transition which was implemented with considerable difficulty after the long "cold war" period, which benefited nobody, could not disappear without a trace. It was the most convincing proof that normal East-West relations are possible. The material fruits which it bore also remain. I am thinking of the coordinated system of economic, cultural, technical, and tourist ties, and so forth. It continues to exist although it perhaps functions unevenly.

What prevents greater flourishing of these "fruits" on the European Continent? When you talk about this with West Europeans they reply: you want to make us squabble with the United States. But we don't want to make anyone squabble, everyone chooses his own allies. We want them, only bearing in mind the commitments that the West Europeans have toward the United States, to nonetheless visualize a picture in which Europeans could develop normal relations on a continental scale without being subject to outside sanctions. No one asks anything more.

[Burlatskiy] When speaking of the problems of civilized relations between the two systems one cannot fail to touch upon questions of ideological struggle. The style and forms of this struggle -- an inevitable struggle that lies at the very foundation of our systems -- can and do differ. The style was quite different during our common struggle against fascism. It has even changed in the postwar period. The West now imposes on us a style of hostility whereby the other side is seen as the enemy, and even enemy number one. This is the style of military psychosis or psychological warfare. It is certainly also one of the indicators of a lack of civilization. Evidently it is necessary to seek forms and methods of ideological struggle which do not hinder cooperation among the peoples in the interests of peace and which prepare the peoples not for the idea of the inevitability of conflicts, confrontation, and military upheavals, but for the need for mutual understanding and joint actions against the nuclear threat.

The U.S. Administration's behavior in the world arena is common knowledge. It is typified by belligerence, expansionism, and self-assurance. But the present U.S. leaders spice all this with rhetoric about "noble aims" and the "defense of peace" and try to use the "Soviet threat" as justification.

[Yakovlev] In fact, U.S. policy is dictated by the purely egoistic interests of the U.S. oligarchy. It is broader in scope and more significant than anti-Sovietism and anticommunism. The U.S. political and economic course is hostile to the national interests of most countries of the world.

For instance, the economic situation in the United States at the end of 1979 nudged its leaders into a policy which only served the interests of the U.S. bourgeoisie. Thus J. Carter made the turn toward new tension in the international situation. The refusal to take part in the Moscow Olympics, the grain embargo, the curtailment of scientific and cultural ties, and the development of subversive propaganda -- all this was subordinated to the egoistic interests of the economic elite. What place was there for civilized relations here?

High U.S. interest rates have made Europe an extremely unreliable refuge for capital investment. An enormous flow of investment has streamed across the Atlantic from an "old continent" living under the "Soviet threat." Wealthy European families have built houses and apartments in New York or Los Angeles as a refuge in the event of serious military danger. U.S. real estate prices have skyrocketed. Demand for dollars and the "greenback" exchange rate have taken off. Thus, hundreds of millions of dollars have left Europe in the period since January 1980, when President Carter announced the sanctions against the USSR. Europe's economic development has been retarded and spending on scientific research has fallen. In other words, the policy of tension declared and organized by the U.S. Administration is costing West Europe dear, reducing its economic competitiveness vis-a-vis the United States.

But tension, like any sick organism, needs injections: new scandals, insinuations, boycotts, fabrications about new "communist misdeeds," and new provocations concerning "human rights," a problem which U.S. politicians have turned into a farce, are needed. Emotions, outbursts of feelings of hatred, passions, and fears about, say, the terrorism organized by the U.S. special services or the shaky "Antonov affair" are needed. All this has profited and continues to profit the Americans, but it inevitably elbows West Europe aside from positions of real influence on world affairs or else channels this influence in a pro-U.S. direction. One way or another the U.S. policy of whipping up tension is increasingly clearly showing its anti-West European essence, to say nothing of the worldwide danger of this course.

Under these conditions it is impossible not to be struck by a gullibility for which billions have to be paid. One can only sympathize with the impotence and torpidity which sometimes seize the ruling forces of the West European countries in the face of the uncerecermonious and self-assured actions of the U.S. ruling elite. A great role is also played by the blinding commonality of class interests, which prevents people from seeing the world the way it is. And yet one cannot fail to be surprised at the chronic shortsightedness of those West European leaders who do not see or refuse to notice the enormous gulf dividing the national interests of this or that country from the egoistic policy of the United States, which ignores all interests except its own.

[Zagladin] Of course, we will never be able to eliminate ideological contradictions as long as the two systems exist.

That is a truism. But the question of the methods of the ideological struggle still exists. It is no accident that the West's psychological warfare poisoned detente, especially during the crisis of the seventies. But psychological warfare is an indicator of weakness, not strength. Bad language has never been an argument. I think that this exacerbation of the ideological struggle was linked with both international and domestic processes of development in the capitalist countries themselves.

[Yakovlev] The world public is now witnessing political trickery on an international scale. Ruling monopoly circles are fervently playing on tension and the "Soviet threat," dishonestly deceiving the peoples of their countries, scaring people, and manipulating their consciousness. Wheeler-dealers have joined in playing on the tension they themselves have created.

What next? War? The cranking up of hatred of socialism? A military-psychological "crusade" against communism? The choice is small -- it boils down to two possibilities: military catastrophe or peaceful coexistence. The intermediate form -- confrontation -- has its own somber logic. Gravitating toward military methods of resolving disputed international issues, it is fostering increasingly widespread protest. Fear of the artificially organized myth of the "Soviet threat" cannot endure forever. Time reveals the deception, removes the blinders woven from lies, and isolates the hired manipulators of public opinion.

But for the time being the United States and its destructive propaganda machine, which destabilizes the psychological atmosphere in the world, are working toward a further exacerbation of international tension of a type that does not rule out nuclear conflict. And the more quickly this is realized, the closer mankind will be to salvation. As for the "Soviet threat," it has nothing to do with it.

As is well known, norms of international law and numerous UN and UNESCO decisions exist which orient the mass media in all countries toward propaganda of peace, good-neighborliness, and cooperation. This is also an important aspect of the principles of civilized relations.

But if we look at the U.S. mass media, their work focuses on fostering hatred of socialism and the Soviet people.

[Burlatskiy] Thus, despite the continuing international tension, our party proceeds on the basis that a world nuclear war is not inevitable, that it can be avoided, and that peaceful coexistence and civilized relations are the sole alternative to thermonuclear catastrophe.

[Zagladin] Realism on the part of the leading Western political forces is also needed.

[Yakovlev] And their political will aimed at developing genuinely civilized relations.

CSO: 5200/1296

GENERAL

PRAVDA OBSERVER ON USSR'S ASIAN SECURITY POLICY

PM251041 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov: "Set About It Together"]

[Text] One of today's urgent tasks is to ensure peace and security in Asia.

In recent years a number of very important constructive initiatives have been put forward on certain aspects of the security of that continent and particular regions. They have been originated by the socialist states and the participants in the Nonaligned Movement.

The proposal put forward by a number of nonaligned countries for turning the Indian Ocean into a peace zone was supported by the UN General Assembly. Both nuclear powers located on the Asian Continent, the Soviet Union and the PRC, have pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Mongolia proposed the conclusion of a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force between the states of Asia and the Pacific. The Indochinese countries--Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos--have taken a number of steps aimed at lessening tension in Southeast Asia and making it a zone of peace, stability, and cooperation. The Soviet proposal to discuss the question of confidence and security measures in the Far East remains in force.

Receiving the Indian head of government in Moscow recently, the Soviet leadership asked: In light of all these initiatives and also of Europe's experience, should not thought be given to a general, comprehensive approach to the problem of security in Asia and the possible pooling of the Asian states' efforts in this direction?

Of course this path is complex, but the road to the all-European conference in Helsinki was not smooth or even. Various methods are possible in moving toward this goal--bilateral talks, multilateral consultations, and in the long term the holding of some kind of all-Asian forum to exchange opinions and jointly seek constructive solutions.

The demilitarization of the Indian Ocean, in which region nearly one-third of mankind lives, would play an inestimable role in security in Asia. From the first the Soviet Union welcomed the idea of proclaiming the Indian Ocean a zone

of peace. This would strengthen the littoral states' security, eliminate the strategic threat to the USSR from the south, and also meet the needs of West Europe and Japan for uninterrupted oil supplies from the Persian Gulf region.

The Soviet Union has stated plainly that it has no intention of creating military bases in that region, and has called on the United States to take the same line, but the Soviet-American talks on limiting military activity in the Indian Ocean area where unilaterally broken off by Washington. Meanwhile, the United States itself is actively building up its military presence there. Basically, a new region of forward-based U.S. strategic forces has been created in the Indian Ocean, in addition to the West European and Far Eastern regions.

The core of the struggle for a peace zone in the Indian Ocean now is the question of convening an international conference on this issue. For some years now, because of sabotage by the Western powers, this conference had had to be postponed repeatedly. The USSR recently reaffirmed its readiness to actively promote the holding of such a forum. Even now, however, without waiting for the conference to be convened, it proposed to all states whose ships use the Indian Ocean that they refrain from any steps which could complicate the situation in the region.

What we have in mind is not sending large naval formations there, not holding military exercises there, and not extending or modernizing the military bases of those states which have such bases. All these steps would improve the political climate for the forthcoming international conference, and its successful completion, in turn, would be an important milestone in the struggle against the militarization of the oceans, and above all in the struggle to limit naval activity where the likelihood of the emergence of conflict situations is greatest.

The Soviet Union proposed more than 4 years ago that concrete talks on confidence-building measures in the Far East be held with all interested countries. As is well known, such measures are already being implemented on the territories of European states, including the western regions of the USSR, under the Helsinki accords.

There is no doubt that the elaboration and application of confidence-building measures in the Far-East--taking account, naturally, of its specific features--could improve the political climate in the region. The Soviet Union has expressed readiness to commence talks on confidence-building measures on a bilateral basis too--between the USSR and Japan, for instance. Such a dialogue would make it possible, in particular, to discuss the question of the security of shipping routes. As an island state largely dependent on imported resources, Japan knows from its own experience that an escalation of military rivalry in the zone of marine communications only increases their vulnerability.

The USSR proposes extending confidence-building measures in the sea and ocean areas, especially in the regions where the busiest shipping routes are to be found. This applies to both the Indian and Pacific Oceans. The limitation

and reduction of naval activity in those oceans would accord with Japan's vital interests.

Most importantly, on the Soviet side an important, concrete step has already been taken toward the strengthening of mutual trust. The USSR has stated quite clearly that it will never use nuclear weapons against states which renounce the production or acquisition of such weapons and do not have them on their territory. The USSR is prepared to put this pledge in the form of an international agreement, and in particular to commence an exchange of opinions on this score with Japan (within the framework on talks on confidence-building measures in the Far East or in other forms). Japan's Constitution and the "three-nuclear-free principles" proclaimed by its government could favor the attainment of an accord on this question.

The point is that it is these positive factors which have now become a hindrance to those who regard the Asian Pacific region as the second most important arena of military-political confrontation with the USSR, and Japan as a key link in the anti-Soviet "eastern front." According to the designs of Washington's ruling circles, East Asia and the Pacific and Indian Oceans which wash its shores must become a line for the deployment of forward-based nuclear systems, just as West Europe and the adjacent Atlantic area. What they have in mind is to bring first-strike weapons as close as possible to the Soviet borders along their entire length, and at the same time to use the allies in the West and in the East as lightning conductors to attract retribution to themselves.

American strategists, having declared the goal of U.S. military policy in the region to be confrontation with the Soviet Union "from the Persian Gulf to the aleutians," are backing up this plan with a new military-political structure. They want to "NATOize" Japan, that is, entrust it with the same military commitments as the West European NATO members have; to form Washington's bilateral agreements with Tokyo and Seoul into a triangle; to involve their ANZUS bloc partners--Australia and New Zealand--more closely in the Pentagon's plans, and in particular in the militarization of the Indian Ocean; and lastly, to pave the way for the creation of a "Pacific community" in which they plan to involve--in addition to the United States, Japan, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Korea--the members of ASEAN.

It is not hard to see that such plans fundamentally contradict the interests of the Asian and Pacific states which seek to strengthen their independence and achieve social renewal. The liberated countries do not want to be targets for the extortion of profit or the siting of military bases and facilities on their territories. They do not want to be declared spheres of someone's "vital interests."

If we study the nature of the conflicts now taking place in various parts of the world, it is easy to see that, as a rule, what lies behind them is the imperialist powers' attempts to interfere in the young states' affairs and subjugate them to their own will. It is here above all that the reasons are to be found for the emergence of many seats of tension in the world, and not in the notorious "superpower rivalry."

The strengthening of security in Asia is the Asian peoples' own cause. If they are to put this idea into practice together, it is necessary first of all to safeguard the continent against foreign interference. That is why, in calling for a comprehensive approach to the problem of security in Asia and the pooling of the Asian states' efforts in this direction, the Soviet Union at the same time proposed that every permanent member of the UN Security Council pledge to strictly observe the principles of noninterference and nonuse of force or the threat of force in relations with Asian, African, and Latin American countries and not to involve them in military blocs. As for the USSR, it has expressed readiness to make such a pledge.

As the Japanese newspaper MAINICHI notes, "There is no reason to oppose the holding of an all-Asian forum for a joint quest for constructive solutions on the problems of security in Asia." In the newspaper's opinion, the Soviet proposal fits in with the general trend toward peace and mutual understanding, a trend which is indicated, in particular, by the representative nature of the celebrations of the 30th anniversary of the Bandung conference, the movement for a nuclear-free zone in the southern Pacific, and the steps toward a dialogue between North and South Korea.

The Indonesian newspaper KOMPAS recalls that the USSR invariably takes the side of the Asian, African, and Latin American states in their struggle against colonialism and imperialism and does everything to promote their independent development and the enhancement of their role in international life. The proposal on convening an all-Asian forum, the newspaper concludes, is therefore of undoubted interest.

In considering the possibility of putting such an idea into practice, the Asian recalls Europe's experience. After all, the participants in the Helsinki Conference were ultimately not prevented from meeting either by differences in their socioeconomic systems and foreign policy orientation, or even by their belonging to opposing military blocs. Of course, other difficulties are added to all this in Asia: Here there are seats of military conflict, here there is an incomparably larger gulf in levels of development, or to put it more simply, here there are the problems of poverty and backwardness. But even given all the complicating factors, a common denominator exists: the need for peace and security, good-neighborliness and cooperation in order to resolve local, regional, and global problems. The all-Asian process--if it can be called that, any analogy with the all-European process--therefore has some of the preconditions needed for its birth.

The strengthening of security in Asia is an urgent question on which the continent's future depends. The Asian peoples must set about resolving it themselves, together, as masters of their own fate.

CSO: 5200/1281

GENERAL

IZVESTIYA PREVIEWS 'PACEM IN MARIBUS' OCEANS FORUM

PM030718 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 May 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by Doctor of Juridical Sciences A. Kolodkin, chairman of the Soviet Association of Maritime Law, and Candidate of Juridical Sciences V. Kotlyar, member of the Soviet Association of Maritime Law Executive Committee: "For Peace at Sea"]

[Text] The 14th international "Peace at Sea"--"Pacem in Maribus-XIV"--conference is due to open in Moscow. It will be attended by politicians, scientists, and experts from the socialist, developing, and capitalist countries and from a number of international organizations. The conference, which is being held by the Soviet Association of Maritime Law in conjunction with the International Ocean Institute, will be attended by about 400 people.

The International Ocean Institute is a nongovernmental organization whose task includes researching the legal and other aspects of the peaceful use of the oceans and their resources. Annual conferences are held under the institute's auspices to discuss these problems. The 14th conference will be concerned with the legal and economic aspects of maritime transport and international shipping.

In adopting the proposal on holding the conference, the Soviet Association of Maritime Law was acting on the basis that its motto--"Peace at Sea"--symbolizes the peoples' desire for peace and cooperation in the sphere of peaceful utilization and study of the World Ocean. And this desire fully reflects the very essence of the USSR's approach to the solution of the problems of the World Ocean: They must be solved exclusively by peaceful means, on the basis of multilateral cooperation among states, and not by unilateral or other separate and sometimes arbitrary actions. The desire to ensure genuine peace at sea and create an atmosphere for fruitful cooperation among all states fully accords with the spirit and principles of the foreign policy of the Soviet Union which, as was stressed at the CPSU Central Committee April Plenum, is pursuing a Leninist course of peace and peaceful coexistence and advocates a smooth and correct interstate relations based on genuine respect for the norms of international law.

The comprehensive development of international shipping and maritime transport and utilization of the resources of oceans and seas are possible only in conditions of peace. That is why the USSR has repeatedly proposed reducing naval armaments, limiting naval activity, and reaching agreement on confidence-building

measures in various areas of the World Ocean, especially where the busiest sea routes are to be found or where there are conflicts or tension. In particular, the Soviet Union has been consistently advocating the transformation of the Indian Ocean into a zone of peace. The USSR has made well-known specific proposals on this: not to send major naval formations to the Indian Ocean, not to conduct military exercises, not to expand and not to modernize the military bases of those nonlittoral states which have bases.

Practice shows that even complex questions connected with the use of the World Ocean and affecting states' vitally important security interests can be solved successfully given the political will. This is indicated, in particular, by the example of the conclusion in February 1971 of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof.

The constructive Soviet proposals are particularly topical at a time when the Washington administration is increasing its naval armaments and seeking to use the World Ocean for military purposes and to restrict and obstruct freedom of navigation. Essentially the United States wants to arrogate to itself the right to establish in sea areas and in the airspace above them a procedure governing the passage of foreign merchant ships and aircraft, acting as if the waters and the airspace were under U.S. jurisdiction. Washington's aggressive actions off Libya and Grenada, in the Persian Gulf, and off Nicaragua graphically demonstrate that the U.S. administration is seeking to use the World Ocean as an integral part of its global strategy which is stepped in the dangerous ideas associated with achieving world domination. This tendency was reaffirmed by what Reagan himself said recently to graduates of the U.S. Naval Academy.

In these conditions the efforts of the peace-loving states and peoples aimed at the genuinely peaceful use of the seas acquire special significance. The conference participants will be discussing a wide range of problems associated with this objective--from present-day trends in the development of maritime transport and the provisions of the 1982 UN convention on the Law of the Sea relating to shipping to scientific research and the technical, economic, and legal aspects of the use of space for navigation at sea. Protection and conservation of the marine environment will be a special theme at the conference.

The Moscow forum is taking place in a year that sees the 40th anniversary of the United Nations, whose activity in the sphere of the codification and progressive development of maritime law would be hard to overestimate. As a result of its efforts there have been three UN conferences on the Law of the Sea. As a result of many years' work the third conference adopted in 1982 an all-embracing UN convention on the Law of the Sea.

The USSR and the other socialist countries have made a substantial contribution to the elaboration of progressive norms of international maritime law. In particular, a number of important provisions of the 1982 convention which accord with the interests of all countries were elaborated on the initiative of the USSR and the other socialist community countries. It was at the USSR's suggestion that the provisions on a 12-mile territorial waters limit and outer limit of the continental shelf were approved. The Soviet Union has done a great deal to consolidate freedom of navigation on the high seas and to work out a fair

balance of the interests of all countries on questions of safeguarding the right of peaceful passage through territorial seas, preserving the acknowledged freedoms of the high seas, within an economic zone, safeguarding littoral states' sovereign rights in respect of the zone's resources, and ensuring passage for ships and aircraft through straits used by international shipping. The USSR made a significant contribution to the elaboration of the 1982 convention's provisions on the procedure relating to deep-water areas of the seabed, on scientific research in the World Ocean, and on the protection and conservation of the maritime environment.

The seas have served as a means of peaceful communication since ancient times. Today the significance of the World Ocean is many times greater--both for international trade and as a reserve of most valuable resources. The task is to ensure peaceful cooperation among the peoples in the rational utilization of the world's seas and oceans. The 14th "Peace at Sea" conference to be convened in Moscow has the job of promoting this noble goal.

CSO: 1807/357

GENERAL

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL BUREAU MEETING DISCUSSES ARMS CONTROL

Palme Opens Meeting

LD181802 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Bommersvik June 18 TASS -- TASS correspondents Nikolay Vukolov, Aleksandr Yevdokimov and Aleksandr Stepanenko report: A meeting of the Bureau of the Socialist International opened at this locality not far from Stockholm today. Taking part in the meeting are some 30 delegations of social democratic and socialist parties of the world. Representatives of a number of international social democratic organizations were also invited.

Olof Palme, chairman of Sweden's Social Democratic Labour Party, who spoke at the opening of the meeting pointed out that questions of the struggle for peace and the curbing of the arms race are among the most important aspects of the activity of the Socialist International. It assumes special importance now that huge stockpiles of armaments, above all nuclear arms, threaten civilization with destruction. The doctrine of "nuclear deterrence" cannot serve as a guarantee of security. The process of international disarmament under which not one of the sides gets advantages, and equal security is ensured for everybody is the sole alternative to the heightening threat of nuclear war, Olof Palme stressed.

An alarming situation has developed in the world as a result of the arms race, president of the Socialist International Willy Brandt said in his opening speech. Touching upon the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on space and nuclear arms he spoke critically of the United States plans of the militarization of outer space.

The "Strategic Defence Initiative" of the U.S. Administration, the president of the Socialist International said, "complicates not only the course of the talks but also the European debate on security questions". The speaker pointed out that a special conference of the Socialist International which is planned to be held in Vienna next October will be devoted to the questions of disarmament. Willy Brandt pointed to the interconnection of the questions of disarmament with complex problems of world economy which are also on the agenda of the present meeting. Much attention will be paid at the meeting to the situation in the Middle East and southern Africa, to a crisis situation which shaped in Central America.

Sorsa Reports on Disarmament

LD191921 Moscow TASS in English 1836 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Buumersvik (Sweden) June 19 TASS -- The meeting of the Bureau of the Socialist International centered its discussions on issues pertaining to the participation of the Socialist International in the fight for peace and for curbing the arms race, as well as on the difficult problems of the world capitalist economy.

Kalevi Sorsa, chairman of the Consultative Council of the Socialist International for Disarmament, delivered a report on questions of disarmament and arms control. He spoke highly of the USSR's decision to introduce unilaterally a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles in Europe. The resolution adopted on the results of the meeting stresses the importance of the understanding reached between the USSR and the USA in January to examine at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva in package [as received] questions concerning space and strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons. This commitment should be observed, the resolution stresses.

CSO: 5200/1283

GENERAL

TASS: PHYSICIANS AGAINST NUCLEAR WAR HOLD SYMPOSIUM

LD221946 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 22 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 22 TASS -- Physicians who dedicate their lives to serving people, serving life, cannot be silent now that the world is threatened with nuclear catastrophe. To prevent it is the only way to save humanity now. This idea keyed the speeches at the international symposium "Physicians' Role in the Prevention of Nuclear War". The symposium was held in Moscow and was attended by prominent medics from socialist countries, from the United States, Finland, FRG, Japan, other states.

The symposium was held on the initiative of the movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War" that unites more than 100,000 medics from over 50 countries. The movement set up five years ago is gaining ever more supporters since sane people cannot remain indifferent when learning the truth about horrible consequences of nuclear war, prominent Soviet cardiologist Academician Yevgeniy Chazov, the co-chairman of the movement, said, opening the meeting.

The participants in the symposium presented the formation related to the medical and biological consequences of nuclear war, including the conclusions of the World Health Organization. They are that nuclear arms represent a direct threat to mankind's existence. Nuclear weapons threaten with global disturbances of the environment, the climate, which will lead to "nuclear winter". Much attention was paid to the psychological aspects of the threat of nuclear war. It was stressed at the symposium that huge resources are squandered on the arms race.

The struggle against nuclear arms is our main task and we must achieve success, said Professor Bernard Lown from the United States, the co-chairman of the international movement. He said that a regular congress of the movement will be held under the motto "Cooperation, not confrontation" in Budapest, late in June.

CSO: 5200/1292

GENERAL

SOVIET FOREIGN MINISTRY SPOKESMAN ON U.S. TIES, ARMS CONTROL

LD271004 Prague Television Service in Czech and Slovak 2015 GMT 26 Jun 85

[Interview with Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, by Josef Moravek, not further identified; date and place not given; questions and answers in Russian with superimposed Czech translation--recorded]

[Text] [Question] Dear viewers, let me now introduce to you Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I would like to ask him several questions dealing with Soviet-American relations. What is the state of Soviet-American relations to date?

[Answer] To put it briefly, the state of these relations is unsatisfactory. In many respects, there is tension in these relations, but this is particularly reflected in the fact that there has been no progress in the talks on curbing the feverish arms build-up, primarily a nuclear buildup. It is clear that the question of disarmament is the key question not only of Soviet-American relations, but the international situation in general. The fact that the U.S. Government pursues the course of gaining military superiority over the USSR cannot be without negative consequences. Therefore, in talking about obstacles to improving Soviet-American relations, we must say that it is above all the lack of political will by the current U.S. Government. This is reflected in everything, but let me mention one example, a kind of psychological example.

When one meets American political representatives, or observes how they conduct talks or discussions with Soviet representatives, the picture is as follows -- I speak from my own experience, I actually experienced such situations: At the table there are two delegations. One observes, say, George Shultz. Well, he reads the text of the U.S. position as if he is giving some sort of lecture. He does not provide any arguments regarding this position to -- maybe -- convince us of its correctness. He simply reads and reads. The saddest thing is that he does not seek compromises. You will never hear from Shultz: Let us seek a mutually acceptable formula based on equality and equal security; it is as if the political idioms of the seventies have been completely forgotten. What we see is self-righteous and hard behavior which appears to say: Either things will go this way or there will be no agreement at all.

I think that in an attempt to bring back the past, when the United States was able to talk from the position of strength, the present American Government lives under a very dangerous illusion. The essence of objective reality is that the world has changed.

The United States can no longer dictate its conditions, in the first place because an average equilibrium and military-strategic equality have been achieved. This is a factor playing the decisive role at the moment. The USSR has achieved this equilibrium and will not give it up.

[Question] Talking about equilibrium, the official statements of Soviet representatives are known. According to them, equilibrium will be maintained even if the "star wars" plans are realized; that is, the United States will not achieve any superiority. What, then, is the point of the "star wars" plans?

[Answer] As you know, this, so to speak, is the sore point at the Geneva talks. No progress has been made there, not because we now want to accuse the U.S. side in line with the principle: When there is no success, blame the other side. The crux of the matter is in something else -- in the fact that the American delegation and the American Government unfortunately do not want to observe the agreement concluded in Geneva on 8 January between Andrey Gromyko and George Shultz.

The goals and subjects of the talks were clearly defined in that agreement: to assess the whole complex of nuclear and space weapons as an interrelated group of weapons with the aim to halt the feverish arms buildup on the ground and to prevent it in space. Now they appear to ignore this agreement. Just as they did in the past, they now say that the so-called SDI will develop irrespective of the Geneva talks.

We are not alone in viewing things this way. This view is shared by American scientists, including several dozen Nobel Prize winners. We all think that this so-called SDI -- and I underline so-called, because in fact it is an aggressive initiative -- is, first, impossible to realize from the technological point of view when it comes to looking for 100 percent guarantees, and second, they will spend a huge amount of money and yet fail to achieve set objectives.

So here we have the logical question you have put to me -- why? I think that the main cause is in the following. The U.S. military-industrial complex, in particular the California-based aerospace monopolies, who, by the way, made Reagan the President, cannot carry on developing without vast long-term programs stretching over many years. The point is that the world has already, so to speak, been saturated with ordinary missiles. They need something new, something big enough to guarantee truly fat profits for many years to come. The so-called initiative fulfills this role. Multimillion contracts [as heard] are already being concluded. So, huge amounts of money are being given to the monopolies in order to gain military-technological superiority in the hope that the USSR will not be able to keep pace and that the United States has much more advanced computers and technology.

What, then, has gone wrong? The point is that the move A-2, A-4 in their chess game will not be followed by an identical move on our part. I think that our defense policy will be based on the principle that is most important from our point of view: We will not allow the emergence of any threat to our security or the security of our allies, and we will ensure a balanced equilibrium. We do not need any superiority. The danger of "star wars" is that the United States in fact provides a stimulus for another round of feverish arms buildup on the ground, which is something needed by other monopolies. This is a truly fiendish scheme.

One more aspect is worth mentioning. From the point of view of future generations, these plans are profoundly amoral. Do not President Reagan's view: Allegedly, this

is a profoundly moral initiative because it involves the setting up of a kind of anti-nuclear zone; nuclear weapons are not to be allowed to kill people and destroy buildings. It sounds quite attractive, but is unrealistic. You cannot make such a zone totally weapons-proof. I underline, this is the view of American scientists alone. Are they, perhaps, lesser patriots than Mr President?

There is another aspect. Should such a system be created? According to American estimates its maintenance will require \$30 billion annually. It's like repairing a constantly leaking pipe; vast amounts of money are being thrown out of the window. Let's apply the test of morality: Has any living politician the right to adopt decisions which would have to be paid for by children? Should he burden those who are still unaware of such things with his bad decision?

CSO: 5200/1299

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

GORBACHEV: USSR 'WILL ASSESS SITUATION ANEW' IF SDI CONTINUES

LD262225 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Jun 85

[Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at his meeting with the collective of the Petrovskiy Metallurgical Works in the Metallurgists' Palace of Culture in Dnepropetrovsk in 26 June--recorded; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Dear Comrades: In mapping out a trip to the Ukraine--Vladimir Vasiliyevich and I discussed this question in detail; I have visited the Ukraine many times before, many parts of it, but I have never before been to Dnepropetrovsk--we decided that it was essential to visit Dnepropetrovsk this time and essential to meet the metallurgy workers. Dnepropetrovsk is one of our major industrial centers, with great labor, revolutionary, combat, and worker traditions. I am glad to be with you now, glad about this meeting that I asked for--for such a meeting to be organized with representatives of the working class of Dnepropetrovsk, and above all at your works. I offer heartfelt greetings on behalf of the Central Committee and the Soviet Government.

The fact that we are now thinking so actively about our plans, about how to conduct matters in the future, is arousing great interest among our friends in the socialist countries. They support our intentions and are drawing conclusions for themselves, proceeding from the specific situation of every country, because it must be said that, overall, we are faced with common problems, common tasks. We are cooperating actively, and increasingly actively every year, in the sphere of the economy, and all the countries gain from adding together our strengths. For this reason, what we are doing today in the Soviet Union arouses very much lively interest and support in our fraternal countries. Besides this, our friends believe -- and I think that we agree with this -- that the stronger the Soviet Union is, and the better things are with it, then the stronger our whole socialist community will be. [applause]

Our peaceful plans are arousing great interest in the Western countries. I would say that we have many friends there, and not only communists, but also progressively thinking people, people who favor friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union. They also display a great interest in our plans and in our work. Perhaps it would also be worthwhile to say that the peaceful prospect that we are erecting before our society deals a serious blow to anti-Soviet fabrications about the Soviet economy being undemocratic and not dynamic and about its supposed inability to solve large-scale problems of modern scientific and technical progress.

Also -- the main thing -- they discredit the bogey which our class opponents always use, that is the military threat on the part of the Soviet Union. The question is evident: Can a society that is setting itself such grandiose plans connected with the transformation of society, with the development of its economy, the improvement of all spheres of life, the whole way of life; can it think of war? That is absurd to every person with common sense, and we consider such people to be the majority in the world. It is clear that this accusation is not true. This strikes a blow against the slanderers. This is also good. [applause]

A few words about foreign policy. Soviet people are well aware that immense, immense efforts are being made by our party and government to defend peace and to protect our earth from a nuclear catastrophe.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin at one time very clearly expressed the principled position of a socialist state, when he said: We promise the workers and peasants to do everything for peace, and we shall do that. Many years have passed since then. Our people have lived through many bad times, and have had directly experienced the bloodiest wars. With every passing year, our Soviet state became stronger and mightier. Today it is a great world power, ready to give a fitting rebuff to any aggressor. Today, however, we still promise the workers and peasants, even more firmly than ever before, to do everything for peace, and we shall do it. [applause]

The question of questions today is the halting of the arms race which has swept over the world and the transition to reduce the accumulated stockpiles. In principle, we do not need nuclear and other weaponry in order to build normal relations with the capitalist world, if the latter in turn, of course, repudiates aggressive schemes with regard to the USSR and other socialist countries. We are ready to compete with capitalism exclusively in the area of peaceful constructive activity.

We are prepared to seek accord not only about ending the arms race, but about the greatest of arms reductions -- right up to general and complete disarmament. At present, as you know, we are holding talks with the United States in Geneva. The task before them, as the Soviet leadership understands it, is to end the arms race on earth and prevent one in space. We embarked upon the negotiations in order to achieve these aims in practice. But all the indications are that this is precisely what the U.S. Administration and the military-industrial complex which it serves do not want. The attainment of serious accords evidently does not enter into their plans. They are continuing to implement their gigantic program of forcing through the production of more and more new types of weapons of mass destruction in the hope of achieving superiority over the countries of socialism, and dictating their will to them. The Americans have not only failed to put forward any serious proposals in Geneva for curtailing the arms race, but on the contrary, are taking steps that make such a curtailment impossible. I am thinking of the so-called "star wars" program to create offensive space weapons. Talk of its supposed defensive nature is, of course, a fairy tale for the gullible. The idea is to attempt to paralyze the Soviet Union's strategic arms and guarantee the opportunity of an unpunished nuclear strike against our country.

This is the essence of the matter and one which we cannot fail to take into account. If the Soviet Union is faced with a real threat from space, it will find a way to effectively counter it. Let no one, and I say this quite definitely, doubt this. [applause] For the time being one thing is clear -- that is, that the American program for the militarization of space plays the role of a blank wall, barring the way to the achievement in Geneva of the relevant accords.

By its militarist policy the U.S. Administration is assuming a grave responsibility to mankind. If our partners at the Geneva talks continue with their line of playing for time at the meetings of the delegations, avoiding a solution of the questions for which they have assembled and using this time to push ahead with their military programs in space, on the ground, and at sea, we shall then of course have to assess the whole situation anew. We simply cannot allow the talks to be used again to divert attention and to cover up military preparations, whose purpose is to secure U.S. strategic superiority and achieve world dominance. In rebuffing these schemes I am confident that we will be supported by the really peace-loving forces throughout the whole world and that we will be supported by the Soviet people. [applause]

The CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Government note with great satisfaction that our peace-loving foreign policy meets with the complete understanding and approval of the Soviet people. But the main thing is that the Soviet people not only approve of it, but that they back it up with their actions, their work. And the more successful this work is, the richer and stronger our homeland becomes, and the more substantial the contribution it makes to the cause of universal peace and the progress of mankind. [applause]

CSO: 5200/1282

19 July 1985

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR'S PONOMAREV DISCUSSES ARMS ISSUES WITH SPANISH LEADERS

Talks With Senate Leaders

LD172105 Moscow TASS in English 1918 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Madrid June 17 TASS--A delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR led by Boris Ponomarev, chairman of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, an alternate member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, today visited the Senate of Spain's Cortes Generales (parliament). The delegation had a meeting with the leadership of the Senate including its president, Jose Federico de Carvajal.

Boris Ponomarev told Spanish parliamentarians about the social and economic development of the Soviet Union, its political system.

Soviet people realise excellently that it is important to safeguard peace on earth for the solution of all these complex large-scale tasks. This determines our course on the international arena, the course aimed at the prevention of war, at the development of mutually-advantageous, goodneighbourly cooperation with all states. Our profound interest in peace is the best answer to those who are trying to intimidate peoples with the so-called "Soviet menace" and to justify the arms build-up with this only argument which is a false one.

We regard the present situation in the world as very complex, more than that, as very dangerous.

The arms race is gathering momentum and is about to be spread into space. Practically, not a single agreement aimed at its curbing has been concluded in the past six years. The volumes of armaments, and the ever more sophisticated mass destruction armaments, are growing, and this means that war danger threatening mankind with nuclear catastrophe is being constantly enhanced. Many fruits of detente, progress, which was developing so successfully in the seventies, particularly in Europe, have been blighted. In Central America, in the Middle East and southern Africa, in Asia, regional crises, far from being overcome, are fraught with conflicts of ever wider scopes. The deployment of U.S. "Pershing" and cruise missiles in Europe has also led to the aggravation of the situation.

We see the root-cause of the evil in the stubborn refusal of the present ruling circles of the United States and NATO to recognise the changes that have taken place in the

world in the past decades (the formation of the world socialist system, the disintegration of colonial empires, the independent road of development, the road of social progress taken by dozens of emergent states). And the United States would like to exert pressure not only on the Soviet Union. It is conducting this course also with regard to developing countries and, sometimes, little-by-little, also with regard to its allies. They in Washington do not want to accept the world of today as it is. They want to remake it, to subjugate it, to impose its own will and economic exploitation on peoples.

Hence an endless, monstrous arms race, above all that of nuclear arms which the ruling circles beyond the ocean are stubbornly whipping up, without giving thought to consequences. And they are urging their partners in NATO to do the same.

Staking on the arms race, Washington is trying to upset the strategic parity in the international scene and to give NATO military superiority over the Warsaw Treaty Organization .

It is here that the one should seek the main, in essence, the only reason of the dangerous development of events. Clearly, the USSR and our allies have no intention of allowing this parity to be upset and will not allow that.

For the United States "star wars" plans serve the aim of giving it the possibility of neutralizing Soviet forces of deterring a potential aggressor and getting a free hand to launch a disarming nuclear attack on our country. It is not an accident that in the Geneva negotiations the U.S. to this date actually does not want to discuss in a concrete way the non-militarization of space, although that problem by mutual consent reached by the representatives of the USSR and the U.S. in January 1985 should be regarded and resolved there in a complex, in interrelationship with other problems of nuclear arms limitation and reduction.

The Soviet Union is strongly against the arms race for it realises full well that no disputed problems, the more so, ideological ones, can be solved in our age on a world scale by the force of arms, and the more so nuclear arms. The security of any state cannot be built at the expense of the security of others. The existing military-strategic balance is the prerequisite of safeguarding peace. Our principle is the principle of equality and equal security of all states. It is certainly best of all to arrive at complete elimination of nuclear arms, at disarmament, to agree on mutual renunciation of the use of force. This would be a truly reliable guarantee of durable peace.

The Soviet Union's policy in the existing conditions has a firm and at the same time constructive nature. Jointly with our allies we have extended for 20 years of operation of the defensive Warsaw Treaty, even though we have invariably repeated and repeat that we are against Europe's split into blocs imposed on us by the West and we are prepared for the simultaneous disbandment of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and, as an initial step, of their military organizations. We are in favour of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization concluding an agreement on non-use of force now, while they exist.

The Soviet Union has submitted for the consideration of international forums in the recent years a whole programme of concrete measures aimed at the limitation and sharp

reduction of armaments, at the improvement of the international situation. That programme has been confirmed again recently. In the days of the celebration of the 40th anniversary of the victory over Fascism, in the address of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers "To the peoples, parliaments and governments of all countries". The Soviet people are convinced that war is not inevitable. There are no international questions, also, that could not be settled at a negotiating table.

Many governments, just as the Soviet Government, vigorously declare against the return to the cold war, for disarmament, for the development of a fruitful, mutually-advantageous cooperation of states regardless of their social system on the principles of peaceful coexistence. The call of the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev for the revival of detente, for the building of a comprehensive system of international security has met with a broad positive response.

Millions of people are now aware of war danger, above all nuclear danger. This awareness is manifested in concrete actions of diverse forces: political parties, trade unions, public organizations, churches. Confronted with this supreme goal -- that of prevention of war -- political, ideological, philosophical differences and distinctions, we believe, must recede to the background.

President of the Socialist International Willy Brandt visited Moscow recently. He also talked about the need of stepping up the struggle against war danger.

In our belief, Europe can and should say its authoritative word in world politics. And in this sense we attach great importance to the development of Soviet-Spanish relations, so to speak, along all lines.

Meeting With Parliament Members

LD181952 Moscow TASS in English 1937 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Madrid, June 18 TASS--A delegation of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR led by Boris Ponomarev, chairman of the Foreign Relations Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities, an alternate member of the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU and secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, had a meeting with members of the foreign relations commissions of the Senate and the Congress of Deputies of Spain's Cortes Generales (parliament). They discussed in detail the state of and prospects for the development of Soviet-Spanish relations, and the situation in the world.

Boris Ponomarev pointed out that the recent exchange of views had shown that Spain and the USSR have a good deal in common in their stand on a number of topical issues of the present-day situation in the world. We mean the prevention of the militarisation of outer space, return to the policy of detente in Europe and outside it, the situation in Central America and in the Middle East. The Soviet Union is ready to broaden the practices of political consultations, to search for a common language with Spain on fundamental international issues.

The Soviet Union appreciates the decision of the Spanish Government to preserve Spain's status as a country free from nuclear weapons. The USSR said that it would never use nuclear weapons against the states which renounce the production and acquisition of nuclear weapons and do not have them on their territory, is ready to conclude special agreements on that score with any of the non-nuclear states. This, certainly, applies to Spain as well.

Then Boris Ponomarev stressed that in the focus of attention of the USSR's international activities are efforts for the total elimination of the threat of nuclear war, for putting an end to the arms race on earth and preventing it from being spread to outer space, for totally scrapping and banning nuclear weapons forever. In a situation, he said, when the most terrible threat ever is hanging over mankind, the sole sensible way out of it is agreement of the confronting forces, an agreement on a clear-cut and equitable basis, without attempts at "outdoing" the opposite side and dictating one's own terms to it.

The message of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., and the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. "to peoples, parliaments and governments of all countries" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the end of the Second World War, Boris Ponomarev said, expresses the Soviet Union's readiness to come to terms with other nuclear powers on imparting an obligatory character to certain norms to which relations between them would be subordinated. Our country has put forward a whole complex of proposals aimed at curbing the nuclear arms race.

In the Geneva negotiations the Soviet Union proposes, above all, to reach agreement on non-militarization of space. Without that any reductions of nuclear forces will be impossible. Further, we propose to reduce substantially strategic nuclear systems -- by at least one-quarter -- and better still, to make even bigger reductions in such weapons.

Our proposals provide for setting a zero level in intermediate-range missiles between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. in Europe, while the U.S.S.R. would retain only as many missiles as two other members of the North Atlantic alliance, Britain and France, have. The missiles slated for reduction in Europe would be destroyed and the deployment of Soviet SS-20 missiles in eastern regions would be stopped (unless, of course, the strategic situation changed there). On the whole, the U.S.S.R. stands for freeing Europe completely of nuclear weapons, both intermediate-range and tactical.

To facilitate the transition to arms reduction, the U.S.S.R. has proposed for the entire duration of the talks a moratorium that would encompass strategic weapons, intermediate-range weapons and space weapons.

For our part we made practical steps at the conference in Vienna, too, toward reaching an early agreement on the reduction of armed forces and armaments. The Soviet Union came out in favor of setting up nuclear weapon-free zones in different regions of Europe and freeing it completely of chemical weapons.

In the interests of improving the international situation our country took major unilateral measures. The Soviet Union pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. Moreover, the Soviet Union undertook the commitment never to use such weapons against the countries where no such weapons are present.

We announced a unilateral moratorium on first launching of anti-satellite weapons in space, as well as on the deployment of intermediate-range missiles in the European part of the U.S.S.R. Earlier, the U.S.S.R. had unilaterally pulled out part of its troops and combat equipment from the G.D.R.

But one cannot fail to mention that our proposals and initiatives are either rejected by the U.S.A. and NATO or altogether ignored by them. NATO takes only decisions on

building up arms. The Warsaw Treaty proposes that it and NATO agree on non-use of force against each other and on developing relations of peace. NATO ignores that call. The Warsaw Treaty has long proposed to come to terms on non-expansion of the blocs. NATO is constantly pressing for the inclusion of new countries into its system, and actually spreads the zone of the bloc's activities to other regions of the world. The Warsaw Treaty countries propose to overcome the partition of Europe into military-political groupings, to disband both blocs, and by way of a beginning -- at least their military structures. NATO ignores these proposals.

And now the United States has adopted the course toward projecting the arms race to space, Boris Ponomarev went on. Weapons for the development of which plans are being made within the framework of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" are not defensive, they are attack, aggressive space weapons. The "star wars" weapons are designed to give the U.S. the possibility of launching a nuclear attack on the U.S.S.R. that would entail no retaliation.

Under the cover of false assertions about some kind of superiority of the U.S.S.R., Washington is forging ahead with all of its programs for the nuclear arms buildup (MX missiles, Trident submarine systems, and new bombers). The deployment of new U.S. nuclear missiles which constitute a threat to the security of socialist as well as other countries of the continent continues in Western Europe.

All this is directed toward eroding at any cost the military and strategic parity that has taken shape in the world. At the same time militarization of space is called upon to promote a situation whereby the U.S. would keep under threat every region of the globe. If these plans are realized the entire world will be faced with the threat of annihilation.

Touching on the issue of the Geneva negotiations, Boris Ponomarev showed that the U.S. was clearly violating the Soviet-American agreement on the objective and subject of the talks. It actually does not want to conduct specific discussions on non-militarization of space, although that problem by the mutual consent reached by the representatives of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S. in January 1985 should be regarded and resolved in interrelationship with other problems of nuclear arms limitation and reduction.

Having embarked on the development of a large-scale ABM system, the U.S. has already begun to undermine the Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. Boris Ponomarev cited specific facts showing how the U.S. kept violating one provision of the SALT-2 treaty after another.

Special mention should be made of Europe. It must not be allowed to become a theatre of military operations, a hostage of somebody's nuclear or other policy. This continent suffered particularly during the Second World War. Our country alone lost 20 million lives. On the basis of its historical experience Europe could make its own contribution to the cause of stabilizing peace on earth, a return to detente and its further development.

This year the Helsinki Final Act will be ten years old. We have made this act the basis of our European policy, which we intend to pursue persistently, seeking a broadening of the dialogue and peaceful cooperation. The Madrid meeting has been a certain stage in the development of this cooperation. It was held in a considerably deteriorated international situation. The Soviet Union highly appreciates the essential contribution to its success made by Spain.

The conference in Stockholm became the next step in the development of the all-European process, Boris Ponomarev said in conclusion.

Our approach to it is based on the fact that a combination of large-scale steps of a political and international legal character with confidence-building measures in the military field would permit to make its results a considerable contribution to strengthening European and international security.

The document "The Basic Provisions of the Treaty on Mutual Non-Use of Military Force and Maintaining Relations of Peace," which was tabled at the conference, accords with the interests of lessening tensions.

Joint Announcement

PM261330 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

["Joint Announcement on the Visit to Spain by a USSR Supreme Soviet Delegation"]

[Excerpts] A delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet led by Boris Ponomarev, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet, alternate member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the CPSU, secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, was on a visit in Spain from June 16 to 24 at the invitation of Las Cortes Generales.

The delegation consisted of V.V. Zagladin, secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Soviet of the Union; P.A. Naumov, secretary of the USSR Parliamentary Group; I.I. Gladkiy, deputy chairman of the Legislative Proposals Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities; and deputies T.V. Gamkrelidze, V.V. Karpov, and N.F. Orlova.

The delegation was received by His Majesty King Juan Carlos I of Spain. A meeting was held between Spanish Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez and Boris Ponomarev, head of the Soviet delegation. In the course of the meeting Boris Ponomarev handed in to the head of the Spanish Government a personal message from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU. Boris Ponomarev also met and talked with Spanish Minister of Foreign Affairs Fernando Moran. The Soviet and Spanish MP's met at Las Cortes Generales. Senate Speaker J.F. de Carvajal; Senate Presidium members J.C. Guerra, L. Urcelay, I. Gaminde, F. Gil, and J. Serrano; and F. Valderrama, chief of the Senate Speaker's Secretariat, took part on the Spanish side in conversations in the Senate. Congress of Deputies speaker G. Peces-Barba and Congress of Deputies Presidium members L. Torres, A. Carro, J. Verde y Aldea, S. de Vicente, M. Fernandez Espana, and J.M. Pedregosa took part in conversations in the Congress of Deputies.

The Soviet delegation met with members of the Foreign Affairs Committees of both chambers of Spain's Las Cortes Generales.

B.N. Ponomarev also had a conversation with M. Fraga Iribarne, leader of the opposition in Las Cortes Generales.

In the course of an exchange of views on a broad range of international issues both sides expressed their concern over the developments of the recent years, the continuing confrontation, and the arms race, which is assuming an increasingly dangerous character.

The Soviet side expressed its conviction that the cause of the current abnormal and dangerous state of affairs is the policy of the leading circles of the USA and NATO, which refuse to face current realities in the world and wish to ensure military superiority over the USSR and the other socialist countries.

The Spanish MP's were familiarized in detail with the Soviet Union's constructive proposals on improving the international situation, which were put forward in the speeches by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the documents of the USSR Supreme Soviet stressing that the Soviet Union does not threaten anybody's security either in the West or in the East. This stand stems from the very nature of the Soviet socialist state. It is determined by the essence of the Soviet people's peaceful creative plans.

The Spanish side pointed out that Spain, which belongs to the Western community, pursues a policy of peace and cooperation with all countries. The stands of the two states are close on a number of issues, above all concerning the need to put an end to confrontation and return to detente, albeit there are different views on other problems. It was stated that the Soviet Union, which knows well what war is like, does not wish an armed conflict, and does not constitute a military threat to Spain.

The representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Spanish Las Cortes Generales were unanimous that it is necessary to effect a change in the course of events, to secure a relaxation of tensions, an end to the arms race and a reduction of arms so as to proceed to a new detente, to the development of normal, civilized international relations between countries irrespective of their social systems. This would accord with the interests of all peoples of the world.

Both sides were agreed that all peace-loving countries and peoples have a stake in a success of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, which are designed to lead, in conformity with the Soviet-American understanding in January this year, to non-militarization of outer space, to a reduction of the strategic nuclear and medium-range weapons.

In examining the situation in Europe, the sides stressed the importance of observance by all countries of the principles jointly sealed at the all-European Helsinki conference 10 years ago. This would make it possible to strengthen security in Europe and to ensure broad, mutually beneficial cooperation of all European countries. It is also necessary to ensure a consolidation of the principle of non-use of force in relations between states and to increase the effectiveness of military confidence-building measures.

The Soviet side has highly appreciated the role of Spain in the successful hosting of the Madrid meeting of the countries participating in the all European process. Both sides declared for a successful completion of the meeting of these countries in Stockholm.

The talks covered problems of the situation in separate regions of the world. The significance was stressed of maintaining relations of peace between the Mediterranean nations, of turning the Mediterranean into a sea of peace and friendly cooperation. The sides have declared for resolving disputable issues and lessening tensions everywhere, in particular, in the Central American region, solely through talks, and are against any interference from the outside in the internal affairs of states.

Upholding the principles of peaceful coexistence, the right of peoples to independence and an independent path of development means upholding peace in this day.

The delegation of the USSR Supreme Soviet extended an invitation to the leaders of Spanish Las Cortes Generales to go on an official visit to the Soviet Union. The invitation has been accepted with satisfaction.

The meetings and talks proceeded in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and well-wishing, under the banner of the common striving to strengthen trust and cooperation between the USSR and Spain.

Ponomarev Writes in Spanish Paper

PM250941 Madrid EL PAIS in Spanish 18 Jun 85 p 6

[Article by Boris N. Ponomarev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo candidate member: "Creation and Peace Are Indivisible"]

[Excerpts] Work for Peace

The Soviet people are devoted to creative work for peace. They do not need war. It is unnecessary to demonstrate that there is an underlying interconnection: In order to improve the socialist society built in our country and to resolve the problems confronting us on a long-term basis, we need a secure peace. Moreover, it would be senseless to set these tasks if we did not aim to maintain peace today and in the future.

This is convincing and objective proof that there is no "Soviet threat"; the fabrications about this "threat" are essentially the only, the false, argument of those who advocate the continuation of the arms race. In the USSR there are no classes or social groups which are politically or economically interested in increased military expenditure and in fomenting international tension. Peaceful coexistence, renunciation of the use of force or the threat to use it, disarmament, and a ban on war propaganda have been endorsed in the USSR Constitution. "The Soviet Union," the USSR Supreme Soviet solemnly declared 23 June 1981, "threatens nobody and aspires to confrontation with no state, East or West."

But we cannot fail to bear in mind that the United States and NATO are operating from stances of confrontation and increasing the weapons aimed against us. The current U.S. Administration's eagerness to achieve military superiority is demonstrated in this and in many other respects. The stances and actions whose goal is to achieve this unattainable aim are directed at spurring on the arms race and subjecting international relations to the arbitrariness and arrogance of the potentates of this world. This is a threat to all peoples and all sovereign states. Under these circumstances, the Soviet Union is adopting the appropriate defense measures. This is not our choice, however, and our aim is different. As Mikhail Gorbachev has stated, we wish to revive the spirit, atmosphere, and significance of detente, and "we intend to continue to advance toward a reliable system of international order and security."

It is precisely this aim which is pursued by the Soviet Union's many peace initiatives. The attention of the peoples, parliaments, and governments of all countries was drawn to them again by the 10 May 1985 appeal of the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers. They are: to prevent the militarization of space; to reach an agreement on nuclear arms limitation and reduction; to reach an understanding to recognize and give compulsory status to certain rules governing relations among the powers possessing nuclear weapons; to have adopted by the nuclear powers which have not yet done so the pledge not to use nuclear weapons first; to conclude between the Warsaw Pact countries and NATO a treaty on mutual renunciation of military force and on maintenance of peaceful relations; to rid Europe completely of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons, as well as chemical weapons; to create nuclear-free zones in the Balkans, northern Europe, and other regions of the continent; not to increase but to reduce military expenditure; to reach mutually acceptable agreements at the Stockholm Conference and in the Vienna negotiations; to eliminate the sources of tension and conflicts among states in various regions; to restructure international economic relations on a just and democratic basis; to increase the United Nations' role and efficiency.

Negotiations

The Soviet approach to the disarmament negotiations embodies the following cardinal points: 1 -- The Soviet Union does not aspire to the attainment of military supremacy over the United States and the NATO countries and does not aspire to the attainment of unilateral advantages, but it will never permit anyone's supremacy over it or over its allies. 2 -- The Soviet Union is resolutely opposed to the negotiations becoming a smokescreen for the subsequent acceleration of the arms race. 3 -- We want a real and thorough reduction of the stockpiled weapons and to avert the creation of more and more new weapons systems, either in space or on earth. This is why the Soviet Union resolutely opposes U.S. attempts to exclude certain kinds of weapons, particularly offensive space weapons, from the Geneva negotiations on one pretext or another, despite what has been agreed.

To prevent the arms race from spreading to space, to halt it on earth, and to carry out in practice a reduction of nuclear and other kinds of weapons -- this is the imperative of our time. As that famous Spaniard Cervantes used to say, it is not weapons but reason that grants real superiority. Now, confronted with the harsh realities of the nuclear era, millions of human beings and the most varied sectors of society have discovered, or are discovering, the great truth of this thought. It is very important that this acknowledgement become universal at last, that this truth become the guiding principle of the interstate policy of all nations, large, medium, and small. Here we are totally and entirely on Cervantes' side.

In the present situation much depends on the European countries. Their role in world politics is objectively increasing. This does not require in the least a choice between an inclination toward the USSR or toward the United States. It is Europe's own stance concerning the measures necessary to maintain and consolidate peace, irrespective of who proposes them. Nobody now can ignore the voice of the European states. Europe possesses sufficient economic and political weight to enable it to really exert an influence on the solution of world problems.

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

KARPOV DISCUSSES TALKS WITH WFTU DELEGATION

Meeting Reported

LD122029 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 12 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva, 12 Jun (TASS)--The on-going arms race and the threat of transferring it to outer space give rise to profound concern among the masses of working people of all continents, stated representatives of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) today. They met with the leadership of the USSR delegation at the talks with the U.S. on nuclear and space arms.

During the conversation Viktor Karpov, the leader of the Soviet delegation, set out the Soviet Union's principled approach to matters aimed at preventing an arms race in outer space and at ending it on earth, at strengthening strategic stability and at removing the threat of nuclear war. Sandor Gaspar (Hungary), WFTU president, told a TASS correspondent after the meeting that the WFTU delegation expressed approval of and support for the Soviet Government's efforts aimed at strengthening peace, at lessening the war danger and at taking concrete measures in the field of disarmament. It is first of all the working people that bear the brunt of both a war and of preparation for it. The strengthening of peace and security meets the vital interests of all working people. The WFTU will promote the attainment of these goals by every means, Sandor Gaspar emphasized.

Commentary on U.S. Attitude

LD141430 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 14 Jun 85

[Viktor Levin Commentary]

[Text] A meeting has been held in Geneva between the leadership of the Soviet delegation to the talks on space and nuclear weapons, and representatives of the WFTU. In the course of meeting the WFTU delegation expressed its approval of and support for the USSR's position at the talks with the United States. Over to Viktor Levin:

The world public is manifesting acute interest in the Soviet-U.S. talks being held in Geneva. This is explained by the fact that these talks are discussing,

and ought to solve questions which have, in the full sense of the word, vital significance for the whole of humanity. In Geneva today it is being determined whether the arms race will be halted and turned back or, on the other hand, go out of control and lead to an even greater deterioration of the international political climate.

Now that the Soviet-U.S. delegations have started their second round of talks, when the principled positions of the sides are no secret, the world public is expressing open concern at the course of affairs in Geneva. It is concerned about the position the United States adopts on the main problems being discussed at the talks. Washington not only does not conceal, but does everything to advertise its plans to deploy nuclear strike weapons in space, the realization of which makes the talks virtually pointless.

The question of renouncing the agreement fixed in the treaty limiting nuclear weapons, signed in Vienna in 1979, known as SALT II, has been placed on the agenda in the U.S. capital. There they also openly attack the termless treaty limiting antimissile defense systems. The U.S. position, as the meeting of NATO foreign ministers held in Portugal a week ago demonstrated, evokes protests even among allies in the North Atlantic Bloc. It is criticized particularly severely by the North Atlantic Bloc. It is criticized particularly severely by the world public. People of the world want confidence in the future, are striving for an end to the arms race, and they appeal to the participants in the Geneva talks for this.

If the position of the United States evokes concern and disappointment among them, the position of the USSR provides peace-loving forces with confidence in the possibility of turning the development of international relations back to normal channels. In fact, the position openly expressed by the USSR provides evidence of the sincerity and honor of our intentions. Our country has submitted a proposal for an urgent moratorium on nuclear and space weapons. Such a moratorium would already have halted the arms race on earth, and would not have allowed it to spread into space. At the same time, the USSR emphasizes that a moratorium is not an aim, but a means of achieving a genuinely just agreement on principles of equality and equal security between the states. Proceeding from this, the USSR proposed that the USSR and the United States, in setting up a moratorium, should agree--within a set period--to make specific proposals on all questions being discussed.

The world public views the USSR's position as constructive and just. This was confirmed by the meeting between the leadership of the Soviet delegation of the Geneva talks, with representatives of the WFTU, which covers more than 200 million working people from 80 countries.

CSO: 5200/1280

19 July 1985

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS REPORTS PROCEEDINGS 24-27 JUNE

Plenary Meeting 24 June

LD241512 Moscow TASS in English 1451 GMT 24 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 24 TASS--A plenary meeting of the delegations of the USSR and the USA has been held at the talks on nuclear and space weapons here today.

Space Arms Group 25 June

LD251231 Moscow TASS in English 1222 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 25 TASS--The group on space arms at Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons held a meeting here today.

Strategic Arms Group 26 June

LD261155 Moscow TASS in English 1124 GMT 26 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 26 TASS--A session of the group for strategic armaments was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons.

INF Group 27 June

LD271259 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 27 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 27 TASS--A session of the group for nuclear medium-range weapons was held here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

CSO: 5200/1301

SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW ON U.S. SPACE ARMS RESEARCH, IMPACT ON ABM TREATY

LD230210 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 22 Jun 85

[Text] A major aspect of the current flight by the American space shuttle Discovery is an experiment with a laser component of space arms. The possible consequences of these tests are considered by our military affairs observer Vladimir Petrov.

These tests to perfect arms that can hit objects on earth and above it from space are far from the only ones in the United States. Last summer at an altitude of 160 kilometers a warhead of a Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile was intercepted. The antisatellite ASAT system has also been tested repeatedly, and the delivery vehicle in this system is an F-15 fighter plane; another test of this system is scheduled for next month.

At the same time, many other kinds of research are being carried out in the United States to develop space strike arms. Electromagnetic cannon and other types of exotic arms are being tested in laboratories and on proving grounds. More than 300 U.S. firms are busy (honoring) contracts from the Pentagon under the "star wars" program. Units of combat astronauts are being set up for waging military activities. A joint U.S. Space Command has been formed, and in Colorado work is under way to build a center for controlling hostilities from space. In the meantime the ABM Treaty, signed and ratified by the United States and the Soviet Union, bans the development and testing of systems or components of antimissile defenses based in space. That point is made emphatically and definitely in Article 5 of the treaty.

The U.S. Administration does not stop short of scrapping this important accord. Many political leaders in the United States itself admit this, for example Senator John Kerry. Speaking about tests and other work under the "star wars" program he said that these U.S. actions are either directly contrary to the Treaty to Limit Antimissile Defense Systems or make the treaty pointless. The senator believes these actions violate the treaty not only in form; they make a strike at the very heart of the agreement.

Indeed, the U.S. Administration leaders themselves often make statements from which it becomes clear that they intend to continue the arms race on earth and in space despite anything, disregarding both the current talks on nuclear and space arms and the existing Soviet-American accords and agreements. The U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger demands stopping the observance of the points of the SALT II treaty and adds that the United States will insist on a review of the ABM Treaty when the "star wars" program requires it. As for the talks, Mr Weinberger says his country will be arming itself despite the talks. It won't stop a single military program.

Meanwhile, the consequences of this Washington line for the American people are as dangerous as they are for all the other peoples. The breakdown by the United States of the system of accords to contain the arms race leads to a mounting instability in international relations and intensifies the threat of a nuclear holocaust in which both American and the other continents will perish.

CSO: 5200/1291

SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA: U.S. SPACE ARMS PROGRAMS VIOLATE ABM TREATY

PM251529 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

[Article by Vitaliy Korionov: "International Review"]

[Excerpts] The Main Thrust

Consequently, the USSR is making a particular effort to place mutual relations with the United States on a normal footing. At the Geneva talks the Soviet side is persistently seeking to start a concrete discussion at long last, to embark on a practical examination of the problem of the militarization of space in conjunction with the other problems of nuclear arms limitation and reduction.

The implementation by two Soviet automatic stations of an important stage of the "Venus-Halley's Comet" project was a remarkable success for our scientists, designers and workers and for our science. The Soviet Union, the British magazine THE ECONOMIST writes, is taking "effective and impressive steps in the sphere of space research and is moving ahead at a faster rate than America." (R. Bonne), scientific director of the European Space Agency, noted: "It is a remarkable achievement and a striking example of international cooperation." Soviet people are purposefully realizing the dream of the founder of the theory of space flight, K.E. Tsiolkovskiy, "conquering the universe for the benefit of mankind." This course is fundamentally different from the line pursued by Washington which is striving to turn space into an arena of war.

In particular, the flight by the U.S. spacecraft Discovery is being used to test components of the space strike weapon systems. The course of space militarization is being obstinately pursued. It is clear from statements by official Pentagon spokesmen that more than 800 U.S. firms have already received orders for the production of components for space weapons.

Washington's course of transferring the arms race to space is an obvious violation of the letter and spirit of the 1972 Soviet-American ABM Treaty. The present Washington administration is not only refusing to seek mutually acceptable accords with the Soviet Union in the security sphere, but is trampling on the agreements concluded by previous U.S. Governments. Graphic evidence of this is Washington's desire to demolish the SALT II treaty once and for all. The decision on this treaty, which was made by the White House the other day and which the U.S. bourgeois press is trying to pass off as an

"act in favor of peace," is in fact an act of subterfuge. Unprepared to openly risk opposing the wish to retain the SALT II limitations, a wish prevalent among sober-minded circles in the United States and Western Europe, the White House evidently decided just to postpone its public rejection of the aforementioned propositions for a short while.

The militarists are not going to just sit and wait for something to happen. This is evidenced by the legislative amendment just adopted by the U.S. House of Representatives which is welcome to the White House since it defies observance of the limits by prohibiting the withdrawal and dismantling of a Poseidon nuclear submarine. The notorious "amendment" gives the administration a considerable opportunity to continue "wriggling out" of the SALT II treaty. These are not words, they are real action in Washington.

CSO; 5200/1291

SPACE ARMS

USSR: FURTHER COMMENT ON WEST EUROPEAN RESPONSE TO SDI

NATO Leaders' 'Evasive Approach'

LD051942 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 5 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 5 TASS--TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshov writes:

U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger in an interview with the West German newspaper BILD has stressed that the U.S.'s European NATO partners ostensibly are, on the whole, unanimous that the "Star Wars" programme is of importance to the security of the alliance.

A highly strange statement, for it has no real grounds. For example, how does that assertion square with the fact that France, Norway, Denmark and Greece have already refused to participate in the dangerous U.S. venture. Other allies of Washington are apparently not eager to join in the implementation of the "Star Wars" programme either. The WALL STREET JOURNAL writes in this connection that political leaders of NATO countries show an increasingly evasive approach to the "Strategic Defence Initiative."

The British FINANCIAL TIMES admits that the leaders of West European countries hold that the "Star Wars" programme is a destabilising factor in international relations. Even not all West European colleagues of Caspar Weinberger--the defence ministers of NATO countries--share his raptures over the creation of attack space arms. The cause of that is explained by the London SUNDAY TIMES. It writes that, well aware of the mechanism of the operation of the military-industrial complex of their states, they fear that it will be difficult to stop the "Star Wars express" if it is set going.

U.S. official spokesmen likewise had to admit that the West European allies of the United States regard the "Star Wars" programme without any enthusiasm. Richard Burt, U.S. assistant secretary of state, speaking in a subcommittee of the House of Representatives, has stated that up to now not a single West European government has reacted to the U.S. proposal to inform Washington of an intention to participate in the work under the programme.

Caspar Weinberger is playing cunning, though. All this is no secret to him either. Upon having delivered a 60-day ultimatum to the allies in March this year in the form of an "invitation" to join in the process of militarising

outer space, he afterwards had to change his tone and stated that the matter is by no means in the deadline, that one may overstep the specified time-limit and so on. Quite recently the chief of the Pentagon, having realised how difficult it is to "recruit" accomplices in the "Star Wars," began to assert that he had never thought ostensibly that governments' reply is needed.

And he shifted the emphasis, at least in words, from governments to individual firms and organisations which "will not need a government permission for participation."

Why then is the Pentagon chief again unfoundedly speaking of the "unanimity" of the European NATO partners? Washington has not apparently got used to the fact that this or that ally may have an opinion of its own. It has got into the way of unceremoniously and peremptorily imposing its position on any matter. This time, too, the chief of the Pentagon is pressuring the West Europeans: If the allies refuse to endorse the "Star Wars" programme, that will hardly prevent its implementation or influence congressional support for the plan. Washington also counts on the assistance of those irresponsible West European figures who have already rushed to "publicise" the "Star Wars venture." It is maintained that nothing will be needed to get an official consent from such figures: They will need only to be given "additional explanations" of the "Star Wars" plan. U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has arrived in Western Europe with a view to persuading the allies. U.S. Vice President George Bush is due to leave for Western Europe shortly. And Caspar Weinberger himself is also packing up things. The Pentagon chief has started the manipulation of the allies, or to be more exact continued it, from across the ocean, from a long distance, so to say.

West German Debates

LD071822 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 7 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 7 TASS--TASS news analyst Aleksey Grigoryev writes:

The Bonn officials are trying to reduce to nothing the doubts if the FRG should take part in the preparation of the Reagan programmes of "Star Wars."

Chancellor Helmut Kohl who declares in favour of those programmes has the unqualified support of such representatives of the rightwing circles as chairman of the parliamentary group of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Socialist Union] Alfred Dregger, Defense Minister Manfred Woerner and, certainly, Bavaria's Prime Minister, Chairman of the CSU Franz Josef Strauss. The weekly DER SPIEGEL notes that Kohl realizes the fact that the question of the participation in the U.S. programme might split West European allies in NATO. France refuses to take part in it and Norway assumed the same stand. But Kohl and his closest associates in the CDU are prepared to embark upon that venture.

DER SPIEGEL was on the verge of proclaiming what was said out loud by the French President Francois Mitterrand: That the temptation presented for the FRG by the participation in the implementation of Reagan's plans is explained by the possibility for the FRG to

sidestep the bans that are the consequence of the Second World War. And, as is known, these bans now apply only to nuclear weapons, since the recent decrees of the Western European Union permitted Bonn to produce missiles, strategic bombers, warships and other up-to-date military equipment.

The world press almost unanimously assessed the stand of the FRG with regard to "star wars" as the repayment of Reagan's participation in the sacrilegious ceremony of laying wreaths at the graves of SS men in Bitburg. Bonn has become harnessed ever more securely to Washington's aggressive foreign policy course. The parliamentary opposition emphasizes this circumstance above all.

But then, not even Helmut Kohl's government team is unanimously in favour of Reagan's "star wars". The same DER SPIEGEL pointed out that Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher "does not like the haste about the matter", that "he is dispirited by the fact that no agreement will be reached in Geneva as long as the Americans insist on their space projects". According to press reports FRG Minister for Science and Technology Heinz Riesenhuber has serious doubts concerning the same problem. But the FRG ruling circles do not heed these sober warnings and persist with the efforts to involve the country in an insane and dangerous undertaking of the Washington administration.

French Premier Opposed

LD180916 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Tokyo June 18 TASS--Laurent Fabius, prime minister of France, has denounced Reagan's program of preparations for "Star Wars." He stressed in an interview published today in the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI that the implementation of the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" was fraught with another outbreak of the arms race in space. This is why many West European countries are dubious about the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative," L. Fabius pointed out. Specifically, France opposes the excessive arms buildup and has refused to take part in the U.S. "Star Wars" program.

European Symposium To Advocate SDI

LD211407 Moscow TASS in English 1129 GMT 21 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 21 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports: The High Frontier militarist organization, entrusted by the U.S. authorities to promote the "star wars" program, has announced plans to hold a "European symposium" in Rotterdam, Holland, on June 21 and 22 on how "important and essential" this program is for Western Europe.

Along with the High Frontier leaders, the United States will be represented there by Colonel Gilbert Rye, a member of the National Security Council. Besides, the meeting will be attended by some West European advocates for letting the arms race loose in outer space.

The organization's published plans make it clear that the symposium idea has been due to the U.S. Administration's extreme frustration at West European resistance to the "star wars" program. The Rotterdam meeting is being organized to "teach sense" to the West Europeans.

High Frontier, led by Lieutenant-General (Ret.) Daniel Graham, was formed with the money of the military-industrial complex and the direct support of the administration right after President Reagan unveiled his "Strategic Defense Initiative." It seeks to influence congressional and public opinion in the United States and elsewhere by pushing false arguments like the one that the "star wars" program pursues solely "defensive" purposes.

Anti-SDI Forum in Geneva

LD251253 Moscow TASS in English 1227 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 25 TASS--One of the prime aims of an international discussion meeting for keeping the arms race out of space, which has taken place in Geneva, has been to work out the ways, means and methods of joint action by politicians, public figures and scientists of different countries to prevent the militarization of outer space, Vladislav Kornilov, a member of the Soviet delegation to that meeting, said here. Speaking in an interview with TASS correspondent Valeriy Kostylev, he said the meeting sponsored by the International Peace Forces Liaison forum, was attended by representatives of 25 countries, including Britain, Greece, the United States, Finland, Egypt, India and others.

Speakers there voiced grave misgivings about the U.S. administration's policy of militarizing outer space. Thus, Lieutenant-Colonel (Ret) Robert Bowman of the U.S. Air Force, formerly chief of the latter's office of space systems, demonstrated, on the basis of factual material, the utter fallacy of the "Star Wars" concept and the dangers of its practical fulfillment.

The attendees, Kornilov said, were unanimous that the U.S. administration's "Strategic Defense Initiative" is geared to developing first-strike weapons. That conclusion was proved from both military and technical standpoints. Another destabilizing effect of weapons placement in outer space lies in the fact that the other side will be compelled to take countermeasures, which will of course lead to another spiral of the arms race. The "Star Wars" program is also destabilizing in that even its discussion is undermining the idea of talks and negatively affecting Soviet-American talks in Geneva, Kornilov said.

'Serious Misgivings'

LD301008 Moscow World Service in English 0616 GMT 30 Jun 85

[From "News and Views" program]

[Text] Next we have notes by political observer of the NOVOSTI press agency, Spartak Beglov:

One can understand those West European policymakers who, during meetings and conversations with a high-ranking guest from across the Atlantic, U.S. Vice President George Bush, again failed to show enthusiasm about the notorious Strategic Defense Initiative of President Reagan.

In Western Europe the plan has caused much hard thinking. This time too, the American visitor had to look into serious misgivings of the U.S. partners in NATO over the "star wars" program that causes a menace of further grave destabilization of East-West relations.

Even during his initial conversations in Rome the White House emissary was told about the great hopes the West Europeans were pinning on Soviet-American talks in Geneva and in particular on securing a gradual and balanced reduction in the level of armaments.

As it entered these talks, the Soviet Union showed clearly its determination to steadily work towards this aim alone, but as one wonders, how is it possible to count on reciprocity from the American side when actually from the first few days of the Geneva talks Washington began to block consideration of nonmilitarization of outer space in order to have a free hand in another round of the arms race? In its line to quell the anxiety of the West European partners the U.S. leadership banks on the application of its policy of confrontation against the USSR and other socialist countries. This stake on the confrontation goals of Reaganism as a sort of whip in relations with U.S. partners can be traced with increasing clarity to the "star wars" concept itself, which is the next pretext for undermining an expansion of economic, scientific, and technological ties between Western Europe and the socialist countries. This stake goes so far as to make the West European partners of the United States forget about any alternative. Yet, the alternative does exist, and nothing has cancelled out the beneficial experience of this realization during the period of easier tension.

Moscow and other socialist capitals in Europe keep reminding the West that the positive result of the relaxation of tension between East and West can and must be maintained and multiplied in a linkage with long-term prospects for economic cooperation.

At the recent 40th session of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance in Warsaw a clear-cut pledge was reaffirmed that the nations within the socialist community intend to develop equal relations with the Western states and their economic groupings. In this connection the Council recently advanced a new initiative to start mutually advantageous cooperation with the European Economic Community. The fact that the initiative has been made in the East confirms once again that the socialist countries are consistent and sincere in supporting and developing a line for less tension in the political and economic areas as outlined in Helsinki.

The framework of potential cooperation as the alternative to confrontation is truly unlimited. As the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized recently, the cooperation could extend to space too, however not for the sake of turning outer space into a source of death and devastation, but for the sake of its peaceful exploration in keeping with the peaceable needs of all nations.

CSO: 5200/1291

SPACE ARMS

USSR'S ARBATOV WARNS THAT SDI 'PLAYING WITH FIRE'

PM301740 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jul 85 First Edition p 6

[Article by Academician G. Arbatov: "Playing With Fire"; first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The report that the U.S. Congress had earmarked vast appropriations for "research" on the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" program (commonly known as "star wars") went almost unnoticed over there, clearly because efforts have long been made to accustom both American parliamentarians and the public to the idea of this program. As always, a great many lies were told in the process and it has to be admitted that the lies were sometimes clever. Thus it was that this action slipped through Congress almost without debate. Yet, from the viewpoint of the arms race and the threat of war this may be the most dangerous action for many years...

It has long been clear to people who follow U.S. policy that the Reagan administration has adopted a course of eliminating the system [rezhim] established by the agreements and treaties signed on arms limitation and of wrecking talks on these most important questions. At first, during the 1980 election campaign and the first year of Reagan's rule, Washington generally spoke openly of this. The treaties with the USSR, especially the SALT II treaty, were declared to run counter to U.S. interests (the President himself called this treaty "fatally flawed"). The Republican leadership said it was ready to resume talks with the USSR only once it was able to dictate its will to the Soviet Union, having built up armaments and secured military superiority. However, running up against serious opposition to this line inside the country and among the allies, the administration declared that it would comply with the treaties signed earlier and agreed to start talks afresh with the USSR. But subsequent events have shown that the aim has remained the same and that it was rather a question of a maneuver, of a new tactic whereby treaty pledges are eliminated by removing thin slices of them -- just like slicing a sausage. Talks are held for the purpose of never reaching agreement.

At the same time the Reagan administration has also taken a big step backward on the question of attitudes to nuclear war. Despite previous solemn declarations and even treaty pledges by the United States, Washington has focused its efforts on attempts to leap out of the nuclear stalemate by returning somehow to a situation in which war can be waged with impunity in the expectation of victory. Once again, at first this was said openly. I am referring to the Republican Party's 1980 election platform, numerous statements by Defense Secretary Weinberger and his subordinates and by other administration staffers, and also official documents such as the "1984-1988 Defense Guidance." What runs through these is the idea that the United States must regain the

capability to win a nuclear war. One of the scenarios was a "limited" nuclear war in Europe, plans for which were openly discussed in the early eighties. Then, having again run up against growing concern in the United States and the allied countries, they moderated their rhetoric. The policy, however, remained the same. The United States has not abandoned a single military program designed to recover for the United States the opportunity to fight without risking suicide -- in other words, to acquire what strategic jargon calls a "first strike capability."

The "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) embodies both these schemes particularly fully. It is designed to serve on the one hand as the main instrument for wrecking the entire arms limitation process, and on the other as a means of gaining a "first strike" capability (in combination, of course, with other weapons systems -- missiles that are being developed for a preemptive strike against the Soviet Union's strategic retaliatory forces and command and communications centers).

Of course, all this is being hushed up or concealed. By contrast, the U.S. President is presenting the "star wars" project to the public as weapons that will end the nuclear threat and bring mankind to [a time of] universal plenty (as he himself put it, it is a question of weapons that will make it possible to "renounce a future that depends to such a considerable extent on the possibility of rapid and massive nuclear retaliation and to switch to greater emphasis on defensive systems that threaten no one"). In other words, the promise that is made to Americans and not just to Americans but to all mankind is that the problem of security will be solved at last, solved by means of new technology. Against those who doubt the possibility of doing this the U.S. Government has leveled criticism, declaring that "the history of the development of technology convincingly refutes the unsubstantiated claim that anything is technically impossible."

The incantations have scarcely made this whole fantastic idea any more convincing. First of all, the claim that there is a technological solution to any problem is incorrect. It is incorrect even for problems of a technical nature. For instance, it is fundamentally impossible to create a perpetual motion machine, to overcome the operation of physical laws, or to give man physiological immortality.

What President Reagan is promising to bring about by the "star wars" program is just as fundamentally inconceivable. It is, of course, possible to imagine that with the aid of new types of weapons -- mysterious rays, supersupercomputers, and so forth -- in time (even the enthusiasts are promising to do this no earlier than in a few decades) it will be possible to create a system that will be able to down the missiles that currently exist. But by that time will missiles be like those "that currently exist"? The U.S. President has ignored a perfectly self-evident truth: The same human brain, the same research capacities, the same instruments that are employed to create "defensive" weapons will simultaneously work on weapons designed to destroy those "defensive" weapons, to overcome or evade them, or even to find something new against which they are powerless. In this sense the absolute weapons promised by the President cannot exist -- technical progress, science, and technology really cannot be stopped.

If technology cannot ensure security, it is not because it is weak but because the problem of security is essentially not a technical but a political problem. There is no need once again to launch a colossal military program in order to prove this. This has already been proved. After all, the ordinary machinegun was once declared to be the weapon to "end war." Then Dr Teller, who is now a worshiper of "star wars," advertised the thermonuclear bomb as the instrument of "perpetual peace." In short, history has answered the ingenuous question with which attempts are made to mislead uninformed people: If it works, why not give it a try?

However, the infeasibility of the project in the form in which they are trying to "sell" it to American legislators and also to the American public and the U.S. allies does not make it any less dangerous, and dangerous not at some time in the future, but right now, at the stage that is hypocritically described as "research." In fact, it is a question by no means only of research, nor even only of studies and tests of new weapon systems, but of a new round of the arms race that may be unprecedented in its scope and dangerousness.

For instance, take the scale of this "research" -- 70 billion dollars in 8 years are earmarked for it. That is almost five "Manhattan Projects" (at today's prices) or more than two Apollo projects. Yet until now the programs for creating atomic weapons and putting a man on the moon held the record for expenditure.

In fact what lies behind what is called "research and development" is plans for an unprecedented mobilization of funds, scientific potential, and all conceivable resources for a qualitative new spurt in military technology.

A spurt in all spheres: defensive and offensive armaments, nuclear and conventional, space, beam, and kinetic weapons, and any other types. A spurt toward new, unknown dangers that will greatly surpass the dangers of military nuclear technology, although mankind has still not been able to cope with those. Is the world community prepared for such a leap into the unknown, into dangers, into uncertainty? Does it want it? No one has yet asked that question, and the problem has still practically not even been discussed on that level.

What is more, the essence of this problem is concealed in every possible way, and attempts are made to reduce it to something far safer and simpler. Why not try to get rid of the nuclear threat by means of new defensive weapons? Let's just study this problem, then decide what to do.

But "then" it will be too late to decide anything, too late for a whole series of reasons. One of them is that, in addition to the \$70 billion, a huge political price will also have to be paid for the program of what is described as "research," just "along the way," so to speak. One of the first victims of this program would most likely be the Soviet-American arms limitation talks. Their objective was defined in January of this year in the accord between A.A. Gromyko and G. Shultz as the prevention of an arms race in space and the ending of it on earth. Now, so Washington declares, the United States, in defiance of that accord, will in all instances conduct work on creating ABM defenses in order, it is claimed, to find out whether or not this system will work. When it does find this out (according to present plans, no earlier than 1993) the decision will be made whether or not to deploy ABM defenses. If it decides to deploy, only then will the time have come for the next decision: Either unilaterally break the ABM treaty or attempt to persuade the Soviet Union to agree to emasculate this treaty insofar as it failed to prevent implementation of the American plans.

That is an astonishing approach! In this case what will the USSR and the United States hold talks about in Geneva for the next 8 years or more? Until the moment when the United States itself decides what to do next depending on the success of work in the sphere of military technology. When the question is formulated in that way, space weapons are not subject to discussion at all for the next few years. If that is so, then there is no point in discussing armaments on earth either. After all, in the late sixties and early seventies the USSR and the United States reached the unanimous conclusion that the limitation, still less the reduction, of offensive armaments is

impossible without the limitation of defensive armaments. The "star wars" project does not revoke this inexorable strategic logic in the slightest. Thus, the conclusion that suggests itself is that the United States is not even planning to seriously hold talks over the next 8 or more years and regards them more as a propaganda ploy, as an instrument -- forgive me for the unceremonious expression -- for universal swindling. I assume that this is what Washington wants, but do people there think that the Soviet Union too will take part in these unworthy and dangerous games? The Soviet viewpoint on this question was expressed quite clearly the other day by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev: If the United States continues merely to temporize, this will force us to reassess the whole situation.

What has been said makes it possible to draw the conclusion that "star wars" is a destructive mine planted beneath the entire process of arms limitation and reduction, destructive even at the present stage of work on the project. Another conclusion is that "star wars" is a mighty generator of the arms race that destabilizes the military-political situation in the world, for all the untenability and infeasibility of the very idea of creating an "impenetrable shield." The whole point is that even rather imperfect ABM defenses of U.S. territory can be a component of what is conceived as a "first strike" arsenal, especially as the start of work on the new ABM system is being accompanied by the further buildup of efforts to create many types of offensive systems -- the MX, the Midgetman, the Trident II, the B1-B, Stealth, and others -- to say nothing of the fact that it is being accompanied by the further deployment in Europe of American Pershing II missiles, which are intended as a "decapitating" weapon, that is, for a strike against the other side's control and communication centers. Under these conditions the calculation can be based on the assumption that even an imperfect system of defenses will be able to cope with the small part of the other side's retaliatory forces left after the first, "disarming" strike, thereby giving the aggressor a free hand. That is why the nuclear threat will not disappear but will increase with the start of work on the SDI.

So far as President Reagan himself is concerned, "star wars" may indeed, as it is said, be an article of faith, of a thoughtless and fanatical faith that knows no doubts. Even among his close entourage, which unreservedly supports the SDI, there is only a handful of believers, so far as can be judged. The pragmatic calculations of the rest have nothing to do with what the President is promising. These calculations, it seems to me, are as follows.

The present administration represents an extremely conservative part of the U.S. political spectrum and is very strongly influenced by extremist circles and the military-industrial complex, of which the White House incumbent is the stooge. Among the President's entourage, among people who share these extreme views, there are certainly many who realize that the right-wing wave, and still more so the extremist wave, cannot be long-lived. So conscious attempts to consolidate the policy of the extreme right-wingers, to foist it on the country for many years, and thereby to foist it both on Reagan's successors, and, I would add, on the American allies are now increasingly clear in both domestic and foreign policy in the United States. People in Washington are in a frantic hurry precisely because they are trying even under the present administration to make a very dangerous new round of the arms race irreversible -- by virtue of the momentum of the systems that are being set in motion and the creation around them of significant economic and political pressure groups with mercenary interests.

I do not know whether elderly American politicians who now have nothing to lose and younger ones who, never having seen real misfortune, still less war, are accustomed to play at it and have made themselves a career out of this reflect on the threat that this poses to peace, but I am sure of one thing -- that these sorry pastimes may lead to the death of all mankind and that this is real playing with fire.

CSO: 5200/1297

SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. SEEKS TO EVADE ABM TREATY WITH SDI

LD271821 Moscow TASS in English 1807 GMT 27 Jun 85

["Washington: The Continuation of Dangerous Course"---TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

The treaty concluded in perpetuity by the USSR and the USA to limit ABM systems becomes the main obstacle for the U.S. Administration to the fulfilment of its ambitious plans to disrupt strategic parity and achieve military superiority in the world. Washington is prepared to implement at any cost its plans of creating strike space arms, the programme of "star wars". U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger said outright that if it turns out that an absolutely reliable ABM system can be created, the United States will have to overstep the ABM Treaty limitations.

In reality the United States has been undermining the ABM Treaty for a considerable time now. In the opinion of the U.S. Administration the time has come when it should get rid of the foundation of the entire process of strategic arms limitation and reduction. Indeed, the latest flight of the Discovery space shuttle set the beginning to tests of elements of large-scale ABM systems in space.

So the U.S. Administration is looking for the ways to get rid of restrictions imposed by the treaty and to save face while trying to break the treaty. But those who mastermind this step dangerous for peace clearly lack imagination. They make recourse to a hackneyed method, that of shifting the blame on the other side.

A special report of the CIA that was presented to the U.S. Congress is compiled according to this method. The report is, certainly, about the "Soviet menace" to the United States and to the ABM Treaty. It can be compared with similar transoceanic "research" for the absurdities and falsehoods it contains. What is the worth of the assertions that the USSR already has the main ABM components and has even created appropriate potential for their mass production? But the "thesis" that the Soviet Union will be able to deploy a national ABM system as early as 1986 is the ultimate in lies.

If the authors of the "research" believed their allegations if only in the slightest, their civic conscience could have suggested to them the conclusion that it is necessary to recommend to accept immediately the Soviet Union's proposal to impose a moratorium on the development, including research, testing and deployment of strike space arms for the entire period of the talks in Geneva. But the aim of the CIA's report is to incline the legislators and the public opinion to quite a different thing, that the United States

"has a right" not to observe any restrictions imposed on it by the ABM Treaty and to continue implementing the programme of "star wars". This is the real purpose of the report, this is why the accumulations of lies were needed.

All this combined with the recent decisions of the U.S. Administration concerning the Salt-2 treaty shows that Washington persists with its course aimed at the destruction of the system of treaties and agreements, at untying its hands for an even more unrestrained arms race, including that in the new area, outer space. This course is extremely dangerous for the whole world and for the security of the United States itself.

CSO: 5200/1286

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET COMMENTS ON SHUTTLE MISSION TO TEST LASER FOR SDI

Discovery Launched

LD171458 Moscow TASS in English 1431 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Text] New York June 17 TASS -- The space shuttle Discovery roared off into space with seven astronauts aboard from Cape Canaveral. The crew includes two foreign experimentors, namely French citizen Patrick Baudry and Prince Sultan Salman Al-Saud, a member of the Saudi royal family.

During the weeklong mission the astronauts are to make the space shuttle program's first practical test of a component of the comprehensive missile defense with space-based ingredients, which is now being developed in the United States. The ASSOCIATED PRESS reported that it will involve a ground-based laser on the Hawaiian Islands and a mirror installed aboard Discovery. The laser's beam is to be directed to the mirror and received on earth after being reflected.

THE NEW YORK TIMES said the Pentagon attached enormous significance to the experiment from the standpoint of ascertaining the feasibility of hitting enemy missiles with a beam sent by a ground-based laser and reflected to target by an orbiting mirror. The critics of "star wars", the paper said, viewed the experiment as another stage in the implementation of Washington's plans to militarize outer space. Space exploration expert John Pike of the Federation of American Scientists said the test would be a small but a real first step in the direct development of space weapons.

Discovery's mission also provides for releasing four satellites. Three of them are communications ones and the other will be orbited temporarily for astronomical observations and then returned on board with the help of the spaceship's manipulator arm.

Laser Weapons Experiment

LD191944 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] The United States is today carrying out an experiment in the use of a laser for military purposes in outer space. At the microphone is Vladimir Gerasichev, our correspondent in New York:

The experiment is being carried out with the use of the U.S. space shuttle Discovery and is part of a broad program being implemented here with the purpose of creating

laser weapons. From the peak of Maurin Mountain, which is situated on the Hawaiian Islands, a laser ray, which with the aid of a reflector will return to earth, will be directed at the spacecraft. The object of the experiment is to overcome atmospheric interference and maintain the power of the laser ray, using it for short distances as an anti-missile weapon.

Much is being said and written here about the alleged peaceful, defensive nature of this program. However, as has become known, the idea of its creation runs counter to existing accords between two countries in limiting anti-missile defense. According to George Cavert, one of the leaders of the space militarization program and a White House adviser on scientific questions, the creation of the potential to destroy Soviet missiles on their launch-pads is not far short of the main technical task which U.S. military specialists have to solve.

Today's experiment in space and the pronouncements of the leaders of the "star wars" program show that the U.S. Administration is thinking least of all about defense and continues to persistently strive to achieve military superiority over our country.

Failure of First Test

LD202021 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] Washington, 30 Jun (TASS)--The first experiment under the programme to develop weapons systems for "star wars" has been staged with the help of the reusable discovery spaceship which is now in orbit.

The purpose of the experiment was to make it possible for large earth-based lasers to send out beams, which will be deflected by mirrors positioned in orbits and destroy incoming warheads or missiles, Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, who heads the organisation concerned with the implementation of the "Strategic Defence Initiative," said in an interview to the ABC TV company.

The first "shot" was wide off the mark: when the laser beam was directed at discovery, the spaceship was wrongly oriented in space because of an erroneous command from ground control.

Administration officials have to admit that the spread of the arms race into space worries U.S. partners. Addressing journalists, U.S. Vice President George Bush said that Washington's West European allies were suspicious of the administration's programmes to develop large-scale anti-missile defence systems with space-based components.

U.S. Senator William Proxmire, a Democrat from Wisconsin, said in Senate that the U.S. allies were particularly worried by the fact that the "star wars" programme was a violation of the 1972 treaty limiting anti-missile defence systems, which was a basic element of the process of arms limitation.

Impact on Geneva Talks

LD202234 Moscow World Service in English 2010 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] During the current flight of the American shuttle spaceship "Discovery" an attempt was made to test the components of a laser weapon. The experiment failed but it will be repeated this Saturday [22 June]. Dmitiriy (Zakharov) of our staff writes the following on this subject:

The experiment with a reflection of a laser beam by a mirror on "Discovery" was actually a test of space weapons. Spokesmen of the American Government have made a number of assuring statements about its research into space weapons being restricted to pure theory and that there is no question at all of any practical implementation of the "star wars" program. And Washington has asserted that the Geneva Soviet and American talks cannot suffer because of abstract theoretical research.

However, the shuttle flight has graphically demonstrated how this theoretical research is gradually taking the form of practical experiments. Last January Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko already posed the question: Who can guarantee that following the conclusion of this research work, nothing more will be done? Andrey Gromyko said that there would be people who will want to go over to the next stage, to the testing and implementation of this weapon. Evidently the shuttle flight must be regarded in this light.

It's quite obvious that the American delegation sitting at the Geneva conference table knew that these tests were in the pipeline, knew that steps would be taken aimed at undermining the very basis of the talks, for the United States and the Soviet Union had agreed that the negotiations would deal with the whole issue, both of nuclear and space weapons. The latest shuttle experiment makes it doubtful whether the Americans really want the Geneva talks to succeed. If the White House is taking steps aimed against the very substance of one of the two issues to be debated at Geneva, then what kind of an agreement can be reached?

The testing of the laser weapon in space annuls all the statements the United States has made claiming it is restricting itself in this field to theoretical research. It shows that these statements have been made to mislead the public. And in the same way, all (its) statements about space weapons being meant for defense alone are also aimed at camouflaging other plans. As President Reagan's scientific adviser George Keyworth said, the space system can give the United States military superiority over the Soviet Union, and moreover a nuclear advantage. In plain English this means that Washington views the space weapon as a means of achieving military superiority and such intentions make one recall the conceptions of the Reagan administration that speak of the possibility of winning a nuclear war if the United States has the necessary superiority and possibility of inflicting the first nuclear strike. And this doctrine remains in force today, too.

The current experiments make one think seriously about the role of space weapons in American nuclear strategy.

19 July 1985

Success Reported

LD212051 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 21 Jun 85

[Text] The U.S. Air Force has conducted an experiment on the "star wars" program involving a space shuttle Discovery. A laser beam from earth intercepted a spaceship in orbit and was reflected by a mirror installed on board. During this manipulation the possibility of intercepting warheads of an intercontinental missile in flight was checked.

The creation of an antimissile defense with space-based elements is against the 1972 Soviet-American treaty. In the future it is planned to devote two space shuttle flights annually to testing space weapons.

CSO: 5200/1288

SPACE ARMS

USSR'S BOVIN EXPLAINS SOVIET OPPOSITION TO SDI

Defensive Purpose Denied

PM201219 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by IZVESTIYA political observer A. Bovin: "Yet Another Washington Lie"]

[Text] Since the day of its announcement the U.S. President's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), which has become firmly established in the modern political lexicon as the "star wars" program, has been under fire.

The prospect of the spread of the arms race to space and of a corresponding further destabilization of the international situation scares many Americans and their allies. The opponents of SDI cogently argue that even the distant approaches to its implementation are fraught with the intensification of the threat of war. The White House, in turn, is seeking to muster a body of arguments in favor of the necessity and beneficial nature of SDI.

One of the chief arguments is as follows: The measures that are being implemented within the framework of the President's "initiative" should not perturb or frighten anyone; these measures are solely of a defensive nature and therefore threaten no one. "...The nonnuclear destructive power is intended to destroy Soviet missiles..." U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger said. "In no sense is it a weapons system; it is not designed to kill people or to attack targets on earth. Its sole purpose is to use nonnuclear power to destroy missiles in the air." Then there is almost an invocation in the same vein: "SDI is not an arms race, it has nothing to do with arms at all, and it is not even a weapon. It is a harmless means of destroying weapons." The impression is that in the next minute the minister would not only be wringing tears of emotion out of the readers of THE WASHINGTON POST, but would be weeping over his own words...

Now let us try to get down to the bottom of it. Since we are talking about a U.S. "initiative," U.S. plans, and U.S. intentions, let us listen first of all to the Americans themselves.

We will begin with the general approach of U.S. military men to space and to hostilities in near-earth space. There is no whiff of any defensive emphasis here. "Space is the new high-altitude battlefield," Lieutenant General R. Henry, former deputy commander of the U.S. Air Force Space Command, claims. "You don't need a vivid imagination to see that the country that controls space can control the world," U.S. Under Secretary of the Air Force E. Aldridge said. "We must acquire various potentials for waging hostilities

-- 'earth-space,' 'space-space,' and 'space-earth'," General R. Marsh, U.S. Air Force Systems Command chief, explained. Obviously, what he should have said was "harmless hostilities," but in 1983 General Marsh did not know what Secretary Weinberger would be saying in 1985...

Suppose the generals are expressing their own personal "offensive" viewpoint which is distinct from Washington's official "defensive" positions. Such an assumption would be very hard to prove. Information has been leaked to the U.S. press about secret "directives in the sphere of defense in 1984-1988." This Pentagon document proclaims that the United States must prepare to "effectively wage war" from space, for which space systems will be created to "transfer forces to space and from space."

Not so long ago THE WASHINGTON POST quoted extracts from a U.S. Air Force manual signed by Air Force Chief of Staff General C. Gabriel. "Space," U.S. military airmen are taught, "is the outer perimeter of the operational aerospace medium. Space, as part of this medium, provides unlimited potential and opportunities for military operations..." The Air Force, the manual says, "will maintain U.S. technical superiority in the aerospace sphere and will provide the potential for protracted hostilities through the creation of means of waging combat operations in space." It is the purpose of the "star wars" program to accelerate the creation of such means.

In this light, in the light of the statements and documents cited above, the claims that the President's "initiative" is geared to the creation of "harmless" and exclusively defensive systems sound rather hypocritical, to put it mildly.

The problem we are considering has other, more concrete dimensions. While praising SDI to the skies, the U.S. Administration is at the same time emphasizing that in no way does the "star wars" program lessen the need for new offensive weapons systems.

Two new types of ICBM's (MX and Midgetman), a new Trident-II sea-based strategic missile, two new types of heavy bombers (B-1B and "Stealth"), and long-range cruise missiles of all types are in the pipeline.

What is happening then? Well, while apparently placing the emphasis on defense and erecting a shield that is "not even a weapon," the Americans are at the same time refining offensive facilities and sharpening the sword. Why? The answer is really very simple: The United States intends to acquire the potential to launch an offensive, to wage a "victorious" nuclear missile war. "Instead," Senator E. Kennedy said, "of being seen as part of a defensive strategy, the development of a ramified ABM system can only be regarded by the other side as an offensive step." And that's exactly what it is.

This is not just because the "other side" naturally has its own particular perception of the situation, but because the objective content of U.S. plans and actions poses a threat. At the beginning of the year it was reported that the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment had prepared a report saying: "The proposed aim of strategic defense is to ensure a sufficiently powerful defense which would enable the United States to create a serious threat of the use of offensive nuclear weapons..."

So it is "defense" to pose the threat of an offensive, and many people in the United States are aware of this. In late 1983 Robert Aldridge's book "First Strike: The Pentagon's Strategy for Nuclear War" was published over there. If it becomes possible for the United States, the author writes, to intercept "all the Soviet bombers and missiles, with the USSR unable to defend itself against a U.S. attack, the United States will have gained the freedom to attack with impunity... By supplementing the strategic

missiles which are capable of destroying missile silos and the antisubmarine warfare facilities, antimissile defense nudges the United States toward a disabling first-strike potential."

An editorial article in THE NEW YORK TIMES was more cautious but, nonetheless, spoke quite plainly: the President's "initiative" may, although this is not admitted, place America in a situation "where it might threaten a surprise attack and reap the fruits of 'nuclear blackmail'." New York University professor (Mitio Kaku): "The advocates of nuclear war say that a first strike by the United States, no matter how successful, would never be able to destroy all the Soviet counterstrike forces. That is where space weapons must come in. The 10-20 percent of Soviet missiles which may survive a U.S. first strike can be shot down using a laser ABM system. In the jargon of the nuclear war advocates, this is called 'strategic defense'."

If they know this in America, they know it in Moscow too. When we in the Soviet Union hear persistent assurances that the purpose of the "star wars" program is defense and defense alone, we cannot take such assurances seriously. They contradict the real state of affairs and contradict the entire logic of U.S. strategic thinking, as well as the actual potential that lies in the "star wars" program.

According to the experts, including Americans, the "defensive" systems that are being put up into space to destroy missiles could easily be used for strikes against satellites and for strikes from space at ground targets. "The system of space combat stations, which is meant to halt a nuclear attack," Doctor (J. Razer), vice-president of the Kaman Aerospace Corporation, stated, "may, moreover, possess the potential to attack selected targets in space, in the atmosphere, and on the earth's surface." The "targets" they name are tankers, oil storage facilities, power stations, wheeled military vehicles, and so forth; they also talk about being able to use powerful lasers to start forest fires, burn fields and grain stores, and cause fires in cities. All this shows that the weapon systems which are called defensive and "not even weapons at all" are actually space strike means.

Of course, the U.S. Administration flatly denies any aggressive intentions on its part. R. Reagan has said more than once that the United States does not want to acquire a first-strike potential and will not attempt to create one, but it is difficult to believe the President because his words too often conflict with his actions and because these words are definitely at odds with the general principles of U.S. nuclear strategy which is seeking to transform nuclear weapons into an acceptable instrument of foreign policy, to "minimize" the threat of the destruction of the United States, and secure a "victory" in a nuclear missile war. "Anyone who wants to prevent a nuclear war," C. Weinberger remarked, "must be in a position to win it." They are "preventing" by preparing to win. . . .

One well-known U.S. nuclear "strategist" (K. Grey), president of the National Institute of State Politics, prefers to manage without reservations about "prevention." The United States must plan the "defeat of the Soviet Union," he insists, "and at a price that will not prevent economic improvement in our country. Washington must formulate the aims of the war which will ultimately envisage the creation of a postwar world order compatible with Western ideals. . . The combination of offensive means for a strike against armed forces, civil defense, and antimissile and air defense should help limit U.S. losses to approximately 20 million people, which will make U.S. strategic threats more convincing."

In such a system of strategic coordinates the President's "initiative" is inevitably a program for equipping the United States with a new type of first-strike weapon -- a

space weapon -- and a means of destroying strategic military parity and establishing U.S. superiority over the Soviet Union. Any other assessment of the situation would be a dangerous illusion. This is confirmed by the Americans' arguments cited above.

The fact that the U.S. plans are bound to fail is another matter. The Soviet Union will not permit any change in the strategically significant correlation of forces or any violation of the strategic military balance, but we do not want to compete in a space arms race or any other arms race. Not because we are frightened of losing but because no one can win it. This is what determines the Soviet position in Geneva -- a position of tough resistance to all attempts at the militarization of space.

Quest for Superiority Seen

PM241820 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 4, 5

[A. Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Dangerous Illusion"]

[Text] In the system of all-around defense which the U.S. Administration is adopting around its "star wars" program, great importance is attached to the thesis that the advancement of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is by no means aimed at achieving U.S. strategic superiority over the USSR or ensuring the United States the possibility of a nonsuicidal "first strike." Replying to a question from a WALL STREET JOURNAL correspondent, President Reagan stated, "We do not intend to strike a pose as if to say 'so you fell for it. We can inflict a first strike,' I do not think," the President went on, "that our country will ever want to do that." That is what Ronald Reagan claims and I would really like to believe him... but, unfortunately, I have no faith in the U.S. Administration, no faith because we encounter insincerity and attempts to replace major policies with petty ruses too often.

First, the White House's soothing statements are at odds with the entire history of U.S. strategic doctrine, which has always included to a certain extent and to differing degrees of frankness the course of achieving military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. Second, they run counter to current U.S. military policy, which is aimed at combining a modernized offensive strategic potential with developed, multi-layered ABM defenses.

As is well known, nuclear weapons entered the U.S. armory several years ahead of the USSR. Hence the Americans' sense of superiority over us at the start of the nuclear age. Hence also the strategy of "massive retaliation" aimed at totally destroying our country's population centers with impunity. This did not last long. The appearance of a nuclear missile potential in the USSR overturned the strategy of "massive retaliation."

The loss of the U.S. monopoly on nuclear weapons meant that a universal nuclear missile war, if one were to break out, would be a universal catastrophe. It would seem that there is one clear conclusion to be drawn from this: Stop relying on nuclear weapons as a means of political pressure. But no, this conclusion did not suit the Americans and they embarked on another path. If a universal war threatens to be a catastrophe there must be a possibility of limiting and subsequently "winning" it -- that was how the question was posed in Washington.

This possibility, in the opinion of Pentagon analysts, was provided by strategic superiority, which makes it possible to control an escalation of the conflict.

"...The strategists of a limited war," H. Kissinger wrote, "assume the use of the force of our retaliatory strike to be a means which makes it possible for us to wage local wars on our own terms, shifting the risk of unleashing a total war onto our enemy." Thus was completed the transition to the strategy of "flexible response," which proceeds on the basis that, relying on U.S. strategic superiority and retaining "massive retaliation" as a last resort, it is possible to limit a possible conflict to the local framework of theaters of military operations.

Nonetheless, the risk was too great. The equalization of strategic levels forced the Americans to come to the negotiating table. They formally recognized the presence of nuclear missile parity and agreed to the principle of identical security of the sides. Yet, the mirage of strategic superiority gave them no peace.

The United States is transferring the arms race to a qualitatively new level. When signing the SALT I Treaty in 1972 the Americans retained the right to equip ballistic missiles with MIRVed warheads. The idea was clear: to put the USSR in a strategically unequal position by using the U.S. advantage. If that did not happen it would not be the Americans' fault. History repeated itself: When signing the SALT II treaty in 1979 the Americans did not agree to a mutual renunciation of all types of cruise missiles. They did not agree because they again wanted to retain a loophole enabling them to overtake the Soviet Union by technological means -- if one can put it that way -- and make a breakthrough to that alluring strategic superiority. In both cases they were pursuing the goal of ensuring U.S. military-technical superiority and on that basis acquiring the ability to threaten a "first strike" by counting on subsequent survival.

The attempts to play a double game ultimately could not fail to be reflected in the overall situation. Experience showed that by itself the presence of nuclear missile parity serves as a necessary, albeit insufficient, condition for detente. The existence of military-strategic parity must be seen in terms of the complete impossibility of winning a nuclear missile war and, correspondingly, the insanity of striving for strategic superiority in any form. Genuine security is only conceivable as mutual security.

The Americans were unable to overcome this intellectual and psychological barrier. They did not want to come to terms with the fact that parity and the "balance of terror" create a stalemate situation, rule out the possibility of waging and winning a nuclear missile war, and fetter the freedom of aggressive, strong-arm actions in foreign policy. A type of fear of the "balance of terror" arose. Recognition of parity was seen as a sign of weakness and loss of "first place." The concept of equality has in no way gotten through to Pentagon minds: If we are not first it means we are second, that means we are "lagging behind." Stress is laid on a policy aimed at escaping from parity and counterbalancing one's fears by seeking a breakthrough to superiority, and that means obtaining a free hand in foreign policy.

Those were the preconditions for the appearance in the mid-seventies of the doctrine of "limited strategic nuclear war," no longer limited in the sense of being localized in a certain theater of military operations, but in the sense of limited doses of a strictly controlled exchange of "counterforce" nuclear strikes which would be targeted exclusively against the enemy's military targets. With the presumptuousness inherent in U.S. ruling circles it was assumed that the high accuracy and reliability of U.S. missiles will allow them to win out in such a duel.

The advent to power of the R. Reagan administration intensified the militarist trends in Washington's policy and started the mass arms buildup. Demands were openly made to change the prevailing balance of forces, but, of course, not for the sake of achieving superiority. God forbid!

The "weak" and "enfeebled" America that has been pushed back into "second place" is simply catching up with a Soviet Union that is way out in front. That is what they have been saying and continue to say in Washington, and they are telling deliberate lies, as has been proven a thousand times over.

For Washington the important thing is not the quest for the truth but the quest for a winning position in the strategic field. Carter's doctrine of "limited strategic nuclear war" would seem formally to remain in force, but essentially it no longer suits the White House since there is no guarantee that the "enemy" will accept the rules of the "gentleman's duel" offered it. That means there is no guarantee that the United States will be able to survive.

So what should be done? How can we escape from "mutually assured destruction" and ensure destruction that is also assured but no longer mutual -- the destruction of the enemy? That is how the new U.S. Administration posed the questions. They were answered by the "Strategic Defense Initiative," whose implementation is intended to create an "absolutely reliable" U.S. ABM defense. That is, ensure absolute invulnerability for the United States and, consequently, the wished-for strategic superiority and the possibility not only of threatening and blackmailing but also, by hiding behind a "defensive shield," using a "strong sword" to strike against the Soviet Union.

However, are we not jumping to conclusions? Perhaps it is worth believing the Americans' good, purely defensive intentions? Are we not too suspicious? No, we are not. I have not heard anything about the construction of the "shield" being accompanied by the reforging of U.S. swords into some kind of modern plowshares. It is just the opposite. The modernization of strategic offensive arms announced by R. Reagan 2 October 1981 is proceeding at full tilt, and even the "star wars" program itself by no means boils down to the creation of systems with purely defensive functions. Judging by everything said and written in America, the presidential "initiatives" are essentially a program for the creation of space strike systems suitable for resolving both defensive and offensive tasks.

In general, however one approaches it, R. Reagan's "initiative" can only be seen in the Soviet Union as yet another U.S. attempt to ensure strategic superiority for itself. And that is the assumption not only in our country. "...The Reagan administration," the well-known U.S. scientists S. Hoffman writes, "has brought with it a cruel, all-embracing strategy aimed at acquiring nuclear superiority..." This strategy is illusory. For understandable reasons Americans will never be able to acquire strategic superiority. The illusion at the foundation of the policy is dangerous and in this instance fatally dangerous for all mankind. It may encourage Washington into actions whose consequences are, to say the least, unpredictable, also for all mankind. That is why it is so important to prevent the arms race being transferred to space. That is why the Soviet Union considers this the paramount task.

CSO: 5200/1287

SPACE ARMS

USSR: COMMENTS ON JAPANESE TECHNICAL PARTICIPATION IN SDI

'Dazzled' by U.S. Plans

LD130837 Moscow TASS in English 0714 GMT 13 Jun 85

["In Space Harness"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 13 TASS -- Ever since Washington came up with the idea of militarization of space the ruling circles of Japan have been showing the greatest interest in it among the allies of the USA. The newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA recalls in this connection that an agreement on Japan's participation in a project for building an orbiting station, a component of space arms, was signed with the American National Aeronautic and Space Administration in Tokyo early in May. The two sides held recently in Tokyo regular consultations concerning cooperation in military technology. Special emphasis was laid at these consultations also on joint development of means of warfare in space and from space.

Quoting the French newspaper LIBERATION, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA notes that the Japanese leaders seem to be dazzled by the glitter of the "gold vein" which, they think, military development of space is. They regard this as an opportunity for Japan to join the club of those possessing powerful "post-nuclear" arms systems and to regenerate it as one of the leading military powers of the world. They hope they would not be prevented from doing so either by the anti-war constitution, adopted after Japan's defeat in World War Two, or the anti-nuclear sentiments among Japan's population, sentiments nurtured by memories of the horrors of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It does not appear fortuitous that Prime Minister Nakasone described Reagan's militaristic initiative as "revolutionary".

U.S. Plans To Use Japanese Equipment

LD201959 Moscow TASS in English 1933 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] Tokyo June 20 TASS --- The USA has submitted a list of technological novelties which it seeks to get from Japan for use for military purposes. This was officially stated on Wednesday [19 June] in the foreign affairs commission of the lower house of parliament. Although a highranking spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs did not tell the commission the contents of the request, the NHK TV network with reference to informed sources reports that the USA first of all wants to obtain electronic missile guidance and control systems which the Japanese Defense Agency has been developing for a

number of years now. A research institute of Japan's National Defence Agency, the KYODO TSUSHIN news agency points out, has already created an experimental model of such a system, which is to be handed over to the United States shortly.

The Japanese press points out that the U.S. request opens the way for large-scale deliveries of Japanese military-purpose technology to the United States. Washington shows particular interest in the results of private companies' development efforts which can be used for the realization of the "star wars" programme.

In this connection the newspaper YOMIURI SHIMBUN writes that the supply of such kind of technology to the United States will mean Japan's being practically drawn into the "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) of the White House.

Earlier, the Japanese Government had maintained that a final decision on participation in the SDI would be taken with due regard for the stand of West European countries. But the present U.S. request, as local observers think, is leading to expediting such a decision.

Agreement on the transfer of technological novelties, which can be used for military purposes, to the USA by Japan was reached way back at the end of 1983. It runs counter to the Japanese legislation which bans the export of such kind of technology. The Yasuhiro Nakasone government has made a special exception for the USA, pleading that the USA is Japan's ally which is linked to it by the "security treaty". Thereby the true nature of the pact which has bound Japan closely to the Pentagon's global nuclear-missile strategy is exposed once again.

Trips to Japan by delegations of U.S. specialists have become frequent of late. U.S. specialists studied on the spot the possibilities for broader utilization of the Japanese military-industrial complex and of research potential for military purposes. It is their recommendations that are considered to have been used as the basis for the Pentagon's present request.

Japanese Business Involved for 2 Years

LD210850 Moscow TASS in English 0722 GMT 21 Jun 85

[Text] Tokyo June 21 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vasily Golovnin reports:

The big business of Japan has been directly participating for two years already in the development of space weapons in the U.S. within the framework of the program of preparations of "star wars". This sensational exposure has been made by correspondents of the newspaper ASAHI who got access to some documents of the Pentagon. Specifically, it was disclosed that the American branch of the Japanese corporation "Hitachi Kinzoku" has been delivering since 1982 to secret U.S. military laboratories in Los Alamos specially designed magnetic units which became the main component part of the combat laser using free electrons that is being developed there. This laser will be the most powerful one in a series of combat beam installations which Washington is planning to deploy on the earth and in outer space. Combat capabilities of the laser will be tested soon, ASAHI reports.

Facts show that Japanese big business began to take part in U.S. programs of the militarization of near-earth space without much publicity immediately after President Reagan

announced the sinister plan of the preparation of "star wars". According to the press, right from the beginning the Pentagon has been drawing up plans of the creation of space weapons with due account for the technological achievements of its Far Eastern ally. Apart from magnetic devices for lasers, the U.S. lays claim today on the Japanese developments in the sphere of computer facilities, optical electronics and devices for the rapid transmission of information in the millimetre range which are to become the "nerve system" of the network of combat satellites and ground facilities of the so-called U.S. "anti-ballistic missile defense" with space-based elements.

Demonstrating its "allied loyalty" to Washington, Tokyo has already permitted officially to its private business circles to join the "star wars" program. A spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs said recently in parliament that the Nakasone cabinet was not going to introduce any restrictions on the participation of Japanese business circles in the implementation of Reagan's "Strategic Defense Initiative."

CSO: 5200/1237

19 July 1985

SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW SEES EVIDENCE OF JAPANESE PLANS TO JOIN SDI

LD292106 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1615 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] Early this week, the United States carried out tests on laser-weapons at a near-earth orbit, during the flight of the reusable spaceship Columbia. According to American press reports, they were successful. The test has become another practical step of the American Administration in creating a global and, in the opinion of American imperialists, an impenetrable shield, under cover of which the United States plans to keep both the Soviet Union and other real socialist countries at gunpoint.

Along with the elaboration of other varieties of the strategic armament -- MX and Trident missiles, medium-range missiles, the B-1 bomber which is being handed over today to units of the U.S. Air Force -- the space armaments must, according to Washington's design, create a material basis for delivering an unpunishable strike on the Soviet Union.

This is exactly why talk has been increasing in the United States recently about the possibility of the United States' adopting a new strategic concept by the next decade which would be based on the principle of guaranteed survival -- that is, on the same possibility of inflicting a strike which cannot be retaliated.

Moreover, Reagan's administration is also involving its Far East ally, Japan, in the dangerous "star wars" plans in an increasingly active way. On the other hand, statements are constantly being pronounced in Tokyo that they have ostensibly not elaborated any final position on the issue of participation in the American plans to militarize space. The question is, is it really so? Over to our Tokyo correspondent Pavel Potapov.

[Potapov] Striving to mislead the country's public opinion, the official authorities assert that they will make a decision only after making it sure that the program is of a purely defensive nature. Long before that, however, the green light was given for the participation of Japanese monopolies in the American programs to militarize space. As early as the beginning of last year Tokyo agreed to participate in creation of orbital stations, which are an important element of Reagan's "star wars" program.

The arms race in space has been transformed here into a race of military and industrial concerns to get orders [word indistinct] on pure profit. As soon as the National Council for Exploration of Space announced its participation in creating an American orbital station, local monopolies plunged into feverish activities. On the spot, the leading electrotechnical concern Hitachi formed a council to be concerned with questions of the space base which is designed to wring out profitable government orders for supplies of equipment and up-to-date technology for the U.S. military space project. Similar organizations have been created by other major monopolies of the country, Mitsubishi and

Sumitomo. A special committee, attached to the head of the cabinet, has been created, the task of which is coordination of effort of various government agencies and private concerns.

Moreover, violating the Diet's resolution which prohibits military uses of space research, Tokyo has expressed readiness not only to place all kinds of technology at America's disposal, but also to undertake the elaboration and building of one of the principal elements of the complex, an orbital module.

Recently, delegations of experts from the Pentagon have started to come here on frequent visits to elaborate concrete details of Japan's participation. They display special interest to Japanese research in the sphere of laser technology, microelectronics, and other technical novelties. Tokyo associates its cooperation with Washington in this sphere with hopes of realizing its own military space program. The military agency at present is trying to push through an idea of creating a major spy satellite. A decision has been also taken here to create a powerful carrier rocket.

The course of the ruling circles directed at the participation in American plans of space militarization causes growing concern in the country. The democratic public sees, for good reason, a danger of Japanese involvement in Washington's senseless adventures in the space ambitions of conservatives.

CSO: 5200/1302

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET ARMY PAPER ON MILITARY AIMS OF SHUTTLE PROGRAM

PM211516 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Jun 85 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Reserve Colonel V. Chernyshev, candidate of technical sciences: "The Pentagon's Dangerous Adventurism: What the Shuttle Space Program Conceals"]

[Text] With each launch of the reusable shuttle, U.S. propaganda tries to dazzle the man in the street with some new sensation. That was also the aim of the announcement that one crew would include... a senator. The senator in question was J. Garn, chairman of the Senate subcommittee handling the allocation of appropriations for NASA. The senator himself has stated that he wished to "see for himself" what the U.S. taxpayers' money was being spent on.

Discovery's latest flight includes a 28-year-old Saudi prince, a nephew of King Fahd. The prince, the U.S. press reports enthusiastically, will be taking photographs in space and will give an "account of the rise of the new noon" from beyond the clouds. Beautiful and poetic, is it not? A senator and a prince aboard space ships!

Even President R. Reagan himself was moved and asked Senator Garn to intercede with NASA to allow him, Reagan that is, to go into space during his term of office. A fairly mild and quite harmless joke, completely unlike when the President "let slip" about the beginning of the nuclear bombing of the Soviet Union during a radio voice test. Those and similar reports may seem to the uninformed reader like a peaceful, soothing refrain. And not only to the uninformed! They are also designed to conceal the shuttle program's true aims behind hypocritical verbiage, aims that are far from harmless.

Shuttle-type spacecraft have been assigned an extremely important role in Reagan's "star wars" program. The current U.S. Administration has raised the militarization of space to the level of state policy. It was therefore no coincidence that a shuttle commander, Colonel Jack Loesma, stated with a soldier's typical bluntness: "Space is a place from which the whole world can be kept in fear." That was something which Senator Garn preferred to ignore after "seeing for himself" what is happening in space.

The aims of the Pentagon and of U.S. policy as a whole in the space sphere are set out with particular frankness in the U.S. Air Force combat manual "Military Space Doctrine," which was intended for internal use but appeared in THE WASHINGTON POST. Now something more serious can be seen behind the mask of hypocrisy.

It emerges from the document in question that the United States is pursuing a policy which sets out to "achieve superiority in space." Space, according to the manual, is a place where the U.S. Air Force can "carry out or back up all its operations and tasks" and also "establish the potential for conducting protracted military actions." It goes on: "Such systems can ensure that targets on earth or in space can be hit." That is what the document claims.

How cynical can you be? Whereas for many years the Pentagon has been stating that it deploys systems in space designed to "support" military actions -- observation, reconnaissance, missile launch detection, navigation and communications, meteorological, and other satellites -- now it is talking openly about space systems performing combat functions or, in other words, space strike weapons.

The implementation of those adventurist and very dangerous plans requires systems ensuring a massive (and I stress massive) military penetration of space. The shuttle spacecraft, intended to take military loads into near-earth orbit, is just such a system.

Brigadier General (D. Kutino), spokesman of the U.S. Air Force Space Command, stated bluntly when addressing a U.S. Congressional subcommittee that reusable spacecraft are to transport in all up to 3,000 tons of military cargo into space by the end of this decade and are to become "space transporters." For whom? The answer is simple: for the Pentagon.

The U.S. military intends to complete the operational deployment of the shuttle system by the late eighties. By that time, the foreign press reports, three launch sites should be operational: two at the Kennedy Space Center and one at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. The special take-off and landing complex for military flights at Vandenberg Air Force Base should be operational by next October and Discovery's first takeoff from there is planned for March 1986. Almost \$3 billion has been spent on creating that complex for the U.S. Air Force. The air base garrison already numbers over 14,000 men.

The Defense Department is at present building a "joint space operations center" costing over \$1.4 billion in the Colorado Springs (Colorado State) region. An "aerospace defense center," equipped with around 100 computers, is being built inside galleries at a depth of 500 meters inside Cheyenne Mountain (also Colorado). This center is under the control of the U.S. Armed Forces' Joint Space Command. Foreign observers comment that the commissioning of these centers should ensure the monitoring of the situation in space, the choice and implementation of measures designed to "protect our own satellites," and the use of the shuttle space system for military purposes.

While formulating its plans for the militarization of space, the U.S. Administration is also trying to involve other countries in their implementation. In particular, it is widely known that Washington has been badgering its NATO allies to take part in the militarization of space. The shuttle program is no exception. U.S. representatives have been holding talks with Chile concerning the use of the Mataverí airfield on Easter Island for "emergency" landings by the shuttle.

In February 1985 the U.S. President signed a National Security Council directive on the use of the shuttle program for military purposes. According to a recently published schedule 41 shuttle flights are planned before the end of 1987. Within that program "15 top secret flights" are planned.

The Pentagon is planning to use the shuttle to carry out a broad range of tasks:

The conducting of experiments aimed at developing space-based weapons systems; intelligence work; the interception and inspection of "foreign" satellites; the delivery of military satellites and space weapon elements into near-earth orbit; the servicing, repair, and refueling of military satellites and combat space platforms in orbit; and the assembly of large-scale military space installations in orbit. The possibility is also being examined of using the shuttle spacecraft to carry weapons designed to destroy space installations, to deploy so-called space mines in orbit, and to deliver strikes against "particularly important targets on earth."

The Pentagon proposes paying particular attention within the shuttle program's framework to testing and developing elements of an extensive space-based ABM system. It is planned first to test observation systems, location-finding systems, and target-acquisition and kill-confirmation systems. As General James Abrahamson, director of the "star wars" program, stated in an interview in the Italian newspaper IL TEMPO, they will be testing an early warning system designed to detect missiles in the initial phase of flight, a system for identifying missiles in the passive phase of their trajectory, infrared missile tracking monitors, an optical mirror system, and so forth.

In addition to carrying a Saudi prince, by the way, the Discovery craft which took off on 17 June is also carrying a special experimental piece of apparatus -- a prototype element of a laser weapon. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, some variants of the space-based ABM system contain large mirrors deployed in orbit which receive powerful beams for earth-based lasers and deflect them toward Soviet missiles with the aim of destroying them.

Even that is not all, however; on orders from the Pentagon plans are being drawn up to produce manned for unmanned space systems which could be operated both from earth and from space platforms or from large transport aircraft. The plan is to use them to deliver strikes from space against strategic targets on earth, to perform ABM tasks, to "inspect" installations in orbit, and so forth.

Such are the facts. The Pentagon's "space transporters" pose a serious danger since they are a basic element in the system of facilities designed to implement America's adventurist plans to create space strike systems and turn space into a zone of combat operations. That is why the task of preventing an arms race in space is becoming increasingly urgent and one of the most important areas of the struggle to eliminate the threat of world war.

"There is no people on earth," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has stressed, "who are not alarmed by the U.S. plans to militarize space. That alarm is profoundly justified. Let us examine matters realistically: The implementation of those plans would undermine the disarmament talks and drastically increase the threat of a truly global; all-destructive military conflict. Anyone capable of assessing the situation objectively and who sincerely wants to preserve peace cannot fail to oppose the 'star wars' plans."

CSO: 5200/1286

19 July 1985

SPACE ARMS

SOVIET DEFENSE JOURNAL ON USES OF SPACE SHUTTLE

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 11 Apr 85) pp 45-54

[Article by Col V. Gorenko under the rubric "Air Forces": "The Shuttle Space System in Pentagon Plans"; passages rendered in all capital letters printed in boldface in source]

[Text] Events of recent times convincingly attest that in continuing to excite the arms race, aggressive U.S. imperialist circles are attempting to extend it to outer space. The essence of the U.S. course toward militarization of space is to assure itself dominant positions in the world and achieve strategic superiority over the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with the help of military force and without regard for the interests of other states and peoples.

According to foreign press reports, last year the U.S. president signed Directive No 119, under which a long-term scientific research and development program began on variants of deploying an all-encompassing antiballistic missile defense in near space with elements of space basing and the deployment in space of various kinds of antisatellite systems as well as supernew kinds of weapons for delivering strikes against targets on the land, in the air and at sea. At the same time, it is planned to take steps to improve the survivability of American satellites, particularly by improving their maneuverability, using electronic means of protection, and equipping them with systems for conducting retaliatory fire.

The Shuttle system is given an important role to play in implementing the present American administration's ominous plans for the militarization of outer space and for transforming it into a new zone of combat operations. For example, the Pentagon, which is the principal consumer of this system, considers it to be a key means for stepping up U.S. efforts for the military use of near space, providing for a considerable expansion in the front of military missions accomplished in space and from space and their more flexible and effective accomplishment. According to views of American military experts, use of the Shuttle system will permit a considerable reduction in the time for developing and placing new military space systems in orbit. It is believed that the Shuttle spacecraft (KK) system will be the principal means for placing military payloads in space up to the end of the present century. It is

assumed that the results of the solutions to difficult scientific and technical problems obtained during the implementation of the Shuttle program as well as the system elements which are worked out will serve as a basis for developing more powerful means for putting military cargo in space in the future and, at the turn of the century, for developing a new generation of manned spacecraft and automatic flying craft for the immediate conduct of armed warfare.

The basis of the Shuttle system is a manned, reusable spacecraft of the same name intended for accomplishing a wide range of missions. The system also includes ground support complexes, flight control centers, systems of communications and data relay via satellite, and other facilities. The following have been developed for joint use with the spacecraft within the scope of the Shuttle program: the Spacelab space laboratory which, with the help of various combinations of its basic elements (open platforms and pressurized modules) installed in the cargo bay of the spacecraft, permits conducting a series of various experiments and studies, including of an applied military nature, both with or without the crew aboard; expendable interorbital boosters for transferring satellites from the spacecraft's working orbit to higher orbits, including a stationary orbit 36,000 km up; an unmanned LDEF (Long Duration Exposure Facility) space platform placed into orbit and returned to Earth after an autonomous flight. The latter is intended for conducting experiments in the prolonged effects of the space environment on materials and elements of spacecraft structures and on-board systems.

The SHUTTLE SPACECRAFT (weighing some 2,040 tons at launch) is a cluster which includes an orbital stage with crew, two solid-fuel boosters and an external fuel tank. The orbital stage is designed for being used up to 100 times and the solid-fuel boosters up to 20 times. The only expendable element is the external fuel tank containing fuel components for operation of the orbital stage's main propulsion plant. The craft takes off vertically; it is 56.1 m high assembled (Fig. 1 [figure not reproduced]).

The SHUTTLE SPACECRAFT ORBITAL STAGE is made in an aircraft configuration with a delta wing. It weighs some 115 tons at launch (with a dry weight on the order of 69 tons), it is 37 m long, 17 m high and has a wing span of 24 m. The crew cabin is located in the forward part of the stage and in the rear part is the main propulsion plant and engines of the orbital maneuvering system. The orbital stage is covered with several kinds of heat-shielding covers which protect it from excessive heating and destruction when passing through the Earth's atmosphere during launch and when returning from orbit and landing. Judging from western reports, the surfaces of the orbital stage, which are subjected to the greatest heating, are covered with special tiles made from a material based on silicon and carbon and can withstand a temperature of up to 1,600°C.

The main propulsion plant consists of a cluster of three liquid-propellant rocket engines operating on liquid hydrogen and oxygen and providing a total thrust of over 600 tons at launch. Each of the two orbital stage maneuvering system engines has a thrust of 2.7 tons. A reserve of fuel components

(10.9 tons, with dimethyl hydrazine serving as fuel and nitric acid as the oxidizer) is in two tanks on either side of the orbital stage aft compartment. Additional sets of fuel tanks can be installed in the cargo bay in place of a portion of the payload to improve the orbiter's maneuvering capabilities. An unpressurized cargo bay with opening doors (Fig. 2 [figure not reproduced]) is located in the upper part of the orbital stage fuselage. It is 18.3 m long and some 4.5 m in diameter. The maximum design payload weight placed into orbit in the cargo bay with an inclination of 28.5° when launched from the Kennedy Space Center in Florida is 29.5 tons, and the weight of a payload returned to Earth from orbit is 14.5 tons. The foreign press notes that the maximum design payload weight will be half that for launches of the Shuttle spacecraft from Vandenberg Air Force Base [AFB] in California to an orbit with the highest inclination of 104° , which are planned to begin in January 1986.

A remote manipulator installed on the edge of the cargo bay is used for operations with the payload within the cargo bay and near the orbital stage when it is in orbit. The manipulator is 15.2 m long in the extended position. It is controlled from a panel located in the crew cabin.

The EXTERNAL FUEL TANK is made of aluminum alloys and designed for 713 tons of cryogenic propellant (liquid oxygen and hydrogen). The tank is 47 m high, 8.4 m in diameter and has a dry weight of around 32 tons. Fuel components are supplied through pipes to the orbital stage's main propulsion plant at a rate of up to 4,000 liters per second.

The SOLID-FUEL BOOSTERS are for accelerating the spacecraft on the initial leg of the trajectory for entry into orbit. Their total thrust is over 2,600 tons and they have an operating time of around 120 seconds. The fuel includes ammonium chloride, a special polymer aluminum powder, iron oxide and certain other additives. The grain configuration provides for observance of the necessary law of thrust increase, which creates the most favorable overload conditions (no more than 3) for the astronauts. Each booster is 45.5 m long, has a diameter of 3.7 m, weighs some 590 tons loaded and 78 tons after fuel burns out. Booster nozzles can tilt to an angle up to 7° in an external suspension.

The SHUTTLE SPACECRAFT CREW consists of a commander, pilot, and specialists for the flight program and for working with the payloads. Its size may vary from two to seven persons depending on the tasks to be accomplished in flight and the make-up of equipment and payload in the cargo bay and the crew cabin. Crew members exit into open space through an airlock located in the rear of the cabin (Fig. 3 [figure not reproduced]). The astronauts use the MMU (Manned Maneuvering Unit) backpack propulsive devices with 24 micromotors for autonomous maneuvering outside the orbital stage (at a distance of up to 100 m) and for performing operations with the payload. The devices are attached to the rigid upper part of the spacesuits with lock clamps. They support the astronauts for six hours of work in open space without a safety hal-
yard, after which it is necessary to recharge the batteries and refuel with compressed nitrogen.

The STANDARD CONFIGURATION OF A SHUTTLE FLIGHT has the following principal stages: launch of the spacecraft and placement of the orbital stage into orbit; performance of work in orbit; descent from orbit and landing of the orbital stage. Three ZhRD [liquid-fuel rocket engines] of the main propulsion plant and two solid-fuel boosters ignite at the moment of launch. Immediately following launch the spacecraft makes a banked turn to assure the launch azimuth necessary for attaining a given inclination of orbit. Then a pitch maneuver is executed. Separation of the solid-fuel boosters occurs approximately two minutes from the moment of lift-off after the fuel burns out (at an altitude on the order of 45 km). The boosters continue flying along a ballistic trajectory to an altitude of around 70 km and then land in the ocean by parachute 260 km from the launch site, where they are picked up by special ships and towed to shore for restoration and reuse.

After the solid-fuel boosters are separated the "orbital stage-external fuel tank" cluster continues flight. The main propulsion plant shuts down approximately 8 minutes from the moment of lift-off at an altitude on the order of 113 km and the external fuel tank separates. It flies along a suborbital trajectory and breaks up on entering the dense layers of the atmosphere and its unburned debris falls into the ocean.

After separation of the external tank the orbital stage continues independent flight and, with the help of two successive ignitions of the orbital maneuvering system engines (the pulse lasts 105 and 95 seconds respectively), it moves first into an intermediate elliptical orbit (with a perigee of 110 km and apogee of 280 km) and then into the main circular working orbit of the Shuttle spacecraft at an altitude of approximately 300 km. The spacecraft's maximum flight altitude is around 1,100 km.

The orbital stage's nominal length of stay in orbit is seven days. The stay can reach 30 days with an increase in the store of fuel and expendables aboard or if an emergency situation arises.

To de-orbit using guidance system engines the rear of the orbital stage is turned in the direction of movement, then maneuvering system engines are turned on for approximately two minutes, providing the necessary retarding impulse. When the orbital stage descends to an altitude of 150 km its nose is turned forward. The stage enters the dense layers of the atmosphere at an angle of attack of around 40°, which provides optimum conditions for aerodynamic braking. On descending into the atmosphere the orbital stage glides and maneuvers using the controllable aerodynamic surfaces. Its capabilities of lateral maneuver are around 2,000 km, which makes it possible to reach an alternate landing site if necessary. The orbital stage lands on a runway especially adapted for this purpose at a speed of around 330 km/hr (Fig. 4 [figure not reproduced]).

The SPACELAB SPACE LABORATORY was developed within the Shuttle program especially for multiple flights in the spacecraft's cargo bay (it does not separate in flight). Depending on the specific flight program, the laboratory's configuration anticipates a varying combination of basic elements--habitable

pressurized modules and open platforms with exchangeable equipment for performing applied scientific studies and experiments. Laboratory weight is limited to the Shuttle's maximum returnable payload. From two to four researchers can work within the pressurized modules. They are located in the crew cabin in the stages of entry into orbit, de-orbit and landing and they transfer from the cabin through a tunnel for working in the module in orbit. According to foreign press reports, the work of developing the space lab costs over one billion dollars. The laboratory's first flight in the configuration of a pressurized module and open platform was made in late 1983 during the ninth flight of the Shuttle.

The INTERORBITAL BOOSTERS used with the Shuttle spacecraft include solid-fuel expendable SSUS (Spinning Solid Upper Stage) boosters stabilized by rotation. One of them was developed based on the final stage of the Delta launch vehicle and another is based on the Atlas-Centaur launch vehicle. They are used to transfer payloads weighing up to 1,250 and 2,000 kg respectively to a stationary orbit from the Shuttle spacecraft's working orbit.

The firm of Boeing developed a two-stage IUS (Inertial Upper Stage) solid-fuel booster under a U.S. Air Force order, intended for the transfer of military payloads above all to stationary orbit. It is designed for use both with the Shuttle and as an upper stage of the Titan launch vehicle. The first practical use of the booster together with the spacecraft in 1983 was a failure inasmuch as the payload--a satellite of the TDRS tracking and data relay system--was not placed into the calculated orbit because of a malfunction of the booster second stage engine. This attempt led to a need to modify the booster, which caused cancellation of a number of planned flights and a change in the spacecraft flight schedule in Defense Department interests.

According to the foreign press, new solid-fuel and liquid-fuel boosters, including those operating on cryogenic fuel, are presently being developed for use with the Shuttle spacecraft. It is also noted that the Pentagon is showing increased interest in a project for developing a remotely controlled OMV [Orbital Maneuvering Vehicle] module returnable to the spacecraft cargo bay and equipped with television cameras for making an inspection of satellites and with a device for docking and capture of satellites. The project for developing a remotely controlled module has been under way since the late 1970's, when the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) made attempts to save the American Skylab orbital station by shifting it to a higher orbit to prevent its descent and break-up in the atmosphere.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SHUTTLE PROGRAM began in the United States in 1969, and in 1972 it was elevated to the rank of a national program by decision of the U.S. president. Although the bulk of the financial expenditures for development of the Shuttle system was the responsibility of NASA, the Defense Department joined actively in this work from the very beginning by taking a direct part in formulating requirements for the system which would give fullest consideration to the Pentagon's long-range needs for implementing plans for the military use of space. In particular, as noted in the western press, the load capacity and dimensions of the spacecraft cargo bay and locations of the

launching and landing complexes were chosen based above all on Defense Department interests.

The Pentagon is financing development of the IUS interorbital booster as well as construction of launching-landing and repair-rebuilding complexes at Vandenberg AFB on the U.S. west coast (Fig. 5 [figure not reproduced]) within the scope of the Shuttle program. According to an agreement signed between NASA and the Defense Department, the latter is planning and carrying out all necessary work of monitoring and controlling the Shuttle spacecraft flights in its own interests. Special emphasis here is placed on ensuring secrecy, concealing the nature of military payloads and work performed in orbit, and scrambling flight control communications channels.

Judging from foreign press reports, the U.S. Defense Department has formed its own detachment of 25 astronauts for making flights aboard the Shuttle spacecraft. It is planned to include them in the crews when carrying out operations in space involving secret military payloads. A representative of this detachment participated for the first time in the 15th flight of the spacecraft (in January of this year), during which the IUS booster was used to place a new-generation electronic intelligence satellite into a stationary orbit.

The requirement for resolving a number of difficult problems of a technical nature which arose during development of the main propulsion plant, the heat-shielding cover of the orbital stage and so on for the Space Shuttle led to a two-year delay of the planned beginning of its flights and to a considerable overexpenditure of funds. The first orbital test flight of the spacecraft was made in April 1981 and, judging from foreign press reports, the Shuttle system was placed in operational use from November 1982 on. At the present time the system uses three models of orbital stages (designated the Columbia, Challenger and Discovery), a launching pad at the Kennedy Space Center and a flight control center in Houston, Texas. It takes around two months' time to prepare the spacecraft for another flight (the project envisaged two weeks). The capacity of the system's ground complexes permits making around ten flights of the craft each year.

Full operational deployment of the Shuttle system is expected in the late 1980's. By this time it is planned to have four models of orbital stages in the system (the Atlantis is to become operational in late 1985), three launch sites (two at the Kennedy Space Center and one at Vandenberg AFB) and three flight control centers. The Defense Department is building a joint military space systems control center near Peterson AFB in Colorado, which will include as a component part a Space Shuttle mission planning and control center. The annual capacity of the ground complexes should reach 24 launches. By this same time it is planned to place more powerful liquid-fuel boosters and the remotely controlled OMV module into operational use and to bring the spacecraft's load capacity to the maximum design figure (it now is around 24 tons).

The program for use of the Shuttle system up to the mid-1990's envisages 311 space flights, of which 114 are entirely in Defense Department interests. In the opinion of foreign military specialists, the proportion of Space Shuttle

flights made for the Pentagon actually will be enormously higher considering the possibility of orbiting military payloads as additional ones to the NASA payloads as well as the fact that a significant portion of NASA's space projects is carried out in the interests of the U.S. Defense Department. Of the 311 planned flights, 70 are to be carried out from Vandenberg AFB (using the Discovery and Atlantis orbital stages), of which the Defense Department accounts for 47.

A total of 15 Space Shuttle flights have been made since April 1981 (counting test flights). During these flights a number of satellites, including for military purposes, were placed in near-earth orbits; operations of repairing and refueling satellites in orbit and returning them to Earth were practiced; the effect of the environment in the Shuttle cargo bay on the work of highly sensitive equipment was determined; and a number of studies and experiments of a scientific and applied military nature were carried out. According to information cited in the western press, the following are among the principal tasks which the Pentagon intends to carry out subsequently using the Space Shuttle: delivery of series-produced military satellites for various purposes into near-earth orbits; service, repair and refueling of military satellites and elements of space-based weapon systems in orbit; launches of experimental satellites as well as on-board studies and experiments to develop both future support systems and space-based weapon systems based on various physical principles; reconnaissance, intercept and inspection of space devices; conduct of full-scale tests, including in the area of flight dynamics at hypersonic speeds in the interests of developing military aerospace craft; assembly of large military space devices in orbit. It is also noted that in addition to the above tasks, the Shuttle spacecraft can be used as a weapon platform for destroying space objects, for placing so-called space mines in orbit, for delivering strikes against especially important targets on Earth, and so on.

Over the next few years it is planned to use the Space Shuttle in particular to place the following space equipment into orbit:

--New satellites of the DSCS [Defense Satellite Communications System]-3 strategic communications system and future MILSTAR satellites. The belief is that these satellites will have an increased active life and will have higher survivability, capacity and antijam capability. It is planned to use the IUS interorbital booster to shift satellites from the Space Shuttle working orbit into a stationary orbit.

--Satellites of the NAVSTAR satellite navigation system. The firm of McDonnell Douglas received a contract for producing 28 satellites and SSUS interorbital boosters costing a total of more than one billion dollars and intended especially for placing such satellites (two satellites each during a single space flight) into 12-hour orbits some 20,000 km in altitude from the Shuttle's working orbit.

--New Block-5D-2 weather reconnaissance satellites. They will be placed into near-polar orbits approximately 800 km in altitude from Vandenberg AFB.

--Advanced satellites for detecting the launches of intercontinental ballistic missiles and KH-11 visual [vidovoy] reconnaissance satellites. The latter are to be fitted with a device for orbital refueling (using the Space Shuttle). This will allow extending their active lifetime and will provide greater productivity and flexibility of use. There are also reports on plans for placing a reconnaissance satellite weighing some four tons into a stationary orbit in the late 1980's using the Centaur interorbital booster under development.

Space experiments involving the development of future military space systems are being carried out by the Pentagon within the scope of the special STP (Space Test Program), according to which a list of 39 various experiments was approved in 1982, with a considerable number of them planned to be accomplished using the Space Shuttle. The foreign press has reported U.S. Defense Department plans to develop a military version of the Spacelab based on open platforms installed in the spacecraft's cargo bay. A number of experiments already are being carried out in the Pentagon's interests aboard the LDEF unmanned space platform placed into an orbit some 500 km in altitude in April 1984 by means of the Space Shuttle.

A set of military equipment was installed aboard the Space Shuttle as the principal payload during the fourth test flight: the CIRRIS (Cryogenic Infrared Radiance Instrument for Shuttle) system; the HUP (Horizon Ultraviolet Program) device operating in the ultraviolet band and intended for over-the-horizon observation; detectors of cosmic rays and charged particles; the SEPS (Shuttle Effects on Plasmas in Space) device for studying space plasma; and a space sextant.

The CIRRIS system consists of an optical telescope and interferometer, a spectrometer operating in the 2.5-25 micron band. The principal task in developing this system was to create a highly sensitive telescope which would allow obtaining detailed spectral data on lower layers of the Earth's atmosphere undistorted by infrared signals reflected from the Earth's surface. In the opinion of American military specialists, such data are necessary so that future early warning satellites can accurately distinguish emissions of aircraft and missiles from the background infrared signals of the Earth or atmosphere. The HUP device and the space sextant are for working out more advanced autonomous military satellite navigation systems and the SEPS device is for demonstrating the capabilities of conducting research of space plasma and experiments in the area of communications.

In the first flight of the Space Shuttle from Vandenberg AFB in early 1986 it is planned to place the AFP-888 satellite into a near-polar orbit 740 km in altitude with reconnaissance equipment developed under the Teal Ruby program. As the western press indicates, the purpose of work under this program is to assess the possibility of developing a space system allowing the detection of airborne targets (aircraft and cruise missiles) based on the flame of an operating engine. In particular, it is planned to conduct some 100 experiments during the year for detecting airborne targets against the Earth's

background. During the satellite's flight the reconnaissance equipment's optical system is to be turned to provide for monitoring of a specific sector of the Earth's surface. It is also planned to place aboard the satellite equipment developed under a U.S. Navy task for studying the dispersion of starlight by the Earth's limb, as well as a device for studying sources of emission in the far ultraviolet area of the spectrum.

Sensitive sensors for detecting, locking onto and tracking various targets are being developed under the Talon Gold program. For example, a cryogenically cooled infrared sensor is to detect satellites in orbit and another sensor--a low-power lidar--is to perform tracking and target designation. In the late 1980's it is planned to conduct tests of this gear aboard the Space Shuttle to assess the possibilities of developing detection and target designation devices for a space-based laser weapon system.

The foreign press noted that the Pentagon studied the possibilities of using the Space Shuttle for sending sets of military experimental gear previously installed in high-altitude research rockets into space and returning them to Earth in the course of a single flight as additional (separable or nonseparable) payloads. It is believed that the use of such equipment in Space Shuttle flights will permit a great increase in the time it functions compared with the several minutes of operation in launches using research rockets. It is assumed that one of the first such payloads will be a set of equipment weighing some 450 kg intended for studying x-rays, developed by the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory.

It is also reported that the U.S. Army command considered the possibility of conducting experiments in the interests of antiballistic missile defense using the Space Shuttle. It is planned to accommodate two containers in the Shuttle's cargo bay, one of which is to contain a set of models of ballistic missile re-entry vehicles, decoys and so on and the other is to contain the DOT (Designating Optical Tracker) optical sensor operating in the infrared wave band and intended for tracking them and reading their signatures against the background of the starry sky. This sensor previously was launched using the Castor-4 research rocket and had time-restricted capabilities for measuring characteristics of re-entry vehicles and fragments of ballistic missiles. The western press has expressed the supposition that methods for American warheads to overcome an enemy antiballistic missile defense also will be worked out during the experiments.

The U.S. Defense Department presently is making active use of the Space Shuttle both for developing future space reconnaissance equipment and for immediate accomplishment of reconnaissance missions. For example, during the second Shuttle flight in November 1981 the SIR (Shuttle Imaging Radar) with synthetic aperture was tested in the cargo bay; it is capable of identifying features of the Earth's surface from a space orbit (geological fractures, the uplift and exposure of rocks, and so on), sea currents and ice fields, and industrial and other ground (including buried) and above-water objects. According to the American journal AIR FORCE, data obtained from the experiment indicate the possibility of a substantial advance in accomplishing the mission of detecting

submarines located at a great depth from outer space. An advanced version of this radar, designated the SIR-B, was tested during the 13th flight of the Space Shuttle. Current plans provide for making regular flights of the Shuttle with such a radar aboard.

An LFC large-format photogrammetric camera was aboard the spacecraft along with the radar during the 13th flight. It is intended for precision survey of the terrain to make topographic maps. The American press notes that the U.S. Defense Department also is among the primary consumers of photographs obtained using the camera. This camera is designed for regular flights in the Space Shuttle's cargo bay.

Methods of assembling large platforms and structures in orbit are being practiced by means of the reusable spacecraft. During the 12th Shuttle flight, for example, an experiment was conducted to deploy (and take down) in orbit a large panel of solar batteries (31.5 m long and 4 m wide) (Fig. 6 [figure not reproduced]). The belief is that use of such a panel will make it possible to increase the duration of the Shuttle's orbital flight, in which the Pentagon is interested above all according to the foreign press.

Studies have been begun under the U.S. Air Force AMSC (Advanced Military Spaceflight Capability) program for setting up a scientific-technical base for developing military aerospace vehicles of various types in the late 1990's. They are to be used for delivering space strikes against strategic ground targets, for accomplishing antispace defense missions, for performing strategic reconnaissance, for providing control of armed forces on a global scale, for the so-called orbital inspection, and for working out new means of warfare (laser, beam and other weapons).

Various concepts for developing such vehicles are being worked out actively even now. In the opinion of Boeing specialists, it is possible to develop a spacecraft in manned and unmanned versions based on the Space Shuttle technology as early as the late 1980's. When launched from a Boeing 747 mother aircraft at an altitude of some 7 km, it will be capable of using its own liquid-fuel rocket engine to go into a space orbit using the fuel of the jettisonable external fuel tank. It is believed that its launch weight with the fuel tank will be around 125 tons and its weight in orbit will be on the order of 10 tons, of which a combat payload will account for 3-5 tons. According to plans of Pentagon strategists, vehicles of this type will be able to deliver a military payload to any spot on the globe in approximately 90 minutes.

A concept for developing a military manned spacecraft for operations under conditions of various military conflicts also is being considered. It is assumed that a single-stage craft weighing several hundred tons will take off from the runway of an ordinary airfield and will land on any air base on U.S. territory after performing a combat mission. According to the concept of American military experts, this will provide for flexibility of its use and rather high survivability.

Other concepts of manned and unmanned orbital and suborbital military spacecraft also are being studied. Judging from foreign press reports, the Pentagon is showing increased interest in the idea of developing a small manned spacecraft codenamed Space Cruiser. It has a conical shape, it is 7.6 m long and resembles an enlarged Mk 12 warhead of the Minuteman missile in its configuration. It is believed that up to eight such craft can be accommodated in the Space Shuttle's cargo bay. With the capability of making a so-called plunge into the atmosphere, the Space Cruiser will be able to re-orbit or make a parachute landing in a given area. In the opinion of American military specialists, the craft will be capable of performing a wide range of military missions considering its use of additional external fuel tanks and an external payload, as well as its use in a cluster with interorbital boosters.

In order to develop the technology of future aerospace vehicles, the U.S. Defense Department plans to develop an experimental craft which would be placed into orbit in the Space Shuttle cargo bay and then would make an independent flight in the atmosphere under more difficult conditions than the Shuttle conditions.

The western press indicates that at the present time the Pentagon together with NASA is studying ways of improving the Shuttle system and increasing its capabilities of supporting the execution of adventuristic space plans being nurtured by the present American administration. Washington is resting its hopes on a so-called "technological breakthrough" in space in pursuit of the chimera of military supremacy with the Shuttle system.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1985.

6904

CSO: 1801/230

SPACE ARMS

FRENCH DEFENSE MINISTER ON SDI, EUREKA

PM021428 Paris LE MATIN in French 28 Jun 85 p 3

[Interview with Defense Minister Charles Hernu by Isabelle Legrand-Bodin and Pierre Morville--date and place not given]

[Excerpt] LE MATIN: You were in Muensingen last week with West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner. And yet we have the impression that Franco-German relations are marking time. What do you think?

Hernu: On the contrary, Muensingen demonstrated the vitality of Franco-German cooperation. Far from marking time, this cooperation has been given a very considerable boost since 1982 with the decision to implement all the provisions of the Elysee treaty (especially those relating to strategic dialogue). Our mutual understanding has really been extended. This was demonstrated by my colleague and friend Manfred Woerner last Thursday when he said that we share "common interests and common defense needs," adding, and this is essential because it illustrates the scope of our agreement: "France does not regard the FRG merely as a security zone for it." Indeed, we think that France and the FRG share common security interests and this applies both to protecting Europe from a war or crisis and ensuring our survival if a conflict broke out. These common interests and the awareness we both have of them inspire the whole of Franco-German cooperation in the defense sphere, which consists primarily of mutual confidence.

LE MATIN: However, you cannot deny that there are serious disagreements between the two countries on SDI....

Hernu: Those are your words. Of course it is impossible to wipe out all traces of history. For 30 years Germany has refrained from acquiring nuclear arms. The Germans fully accept that. So, when they see the emergence of a strategic defense program which does not violate any nuclear prohibition they wonder why they should not join it. Yet, I met with our German friends 2 days ago, and they are examining SDI with great caution, and like us, would like to know what is in the stars.

LE MATIN: But it is not just the Germans who are tempted to participate in SDI. Our French industrialists are tempted too. Is this not an obstacle to Eureka's success?

Hernu: No, first Eureka is not a response to SDI. Even if SDI had not existed Eureka would have been necessary. In fact we must mobilize the potential for know-how and knowledge which exists in Europe in the key technologies which will determine our countries' future. I am thinking in particular of big computers, optronics, and

lasers. Second, although they may use identical technologies, Eureka and SDI do not have the same objectives. Although it may, in the future, have military repercussions, Eureka is a civilian program. Finally, our French industrialists have not given a very clear verdict on SDI. They are watching it but they are very cautious because they are well aware that they are being asked to board a train whose destination they do not know. At present, the U.S. program is too vague, imprecise, and uncertain. Moreover, if SDI developed in space one day, with all the arms we are being promised, do you think it would make nuclear weapons redundant? No serious experts would dare say that. Like me, you know what Edward Teller said. He said we should ignore the political statements on the SDI being intended to get rid of all nuclear weapons and that it was a dream. These courageous and clear words -- which I had already heard him pronounce at the Wehrkunde in Munich last February -- agree with the French Government's view. There is no universal strategy in the defense sphere. The message of President Reagan's SDI has a messianic aspect. "Messianism is not a strategy. Statesmen must be realistic." What I do note, however, is that Eureka is taking off very quickly. Just a few weeks after its launch big industrialists are showing that they are prepared to gamble on Europe and technology, even in the most advanced spheres.

CSO: 5100/2676

SPACE ARMS

EC'S DELORS WANTS MANDATE TO NEGOTIATE ON SDI

AU261518 Paris AFP in English 1428 GMT 26 Jun 85

[Text] Brussels, June 26 (AFP) -- Jacques Delors, president of the European Commission, today urged the European Economic Community (EEC) to give him a mandate to negotiate with the United States on the technological aspects of its Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

"If in six months we have not negotiated with the United States," Mr Delors told a news conference here, "there will be a one-way transfer of technology from Europe to the United States. We shall not accept discriminatory treatment or a Japanese-American accord at the expense of Europe."

Mr Delors, who is to meet U.S. Vice President George Bush here tomorrow, said the EEC's Executive Commission "must have the possibility of discussing the purely technological aspects of the SDI with the United States, particularly the transfer of technology."

But he agreed that the strategic component of the U.S. initiative, which is a research effort into space-based anti-nuclear missile defense, would not be discussed, as the 10-member Community remains divided on the question.

CSO: 5200/2673

SPACE ARMS

GREECE EXPRESSES RESERVATIONS ON EUREKA PROGRAM

Athens TO VIMA in Greek 22 May 85 p 25

[Excerpts] The Greek government accepts, with reservations, the proposals of the French government regarding the Advanced Technology Development Program (EUREKA-EUROPEAN RESEARCH COORDINATION AGENCY). The reservations do not mean that Greece rejects the program, but that it accepts it with certain provisions. The government is now completing the study on the subject and will soon give a preliminary answer to the French government regarding the possibilities of implementing the program.

Diplomatic circles maintain that it is understood that the participation of each member-country in the program will be accompanied by financial contributions (exceptionally high, as a matter of fact), a fact that is approached with certain reservations by the less developed countries such as Greece. Developed countries that do not have the infrastructure to take advantage of the implementation of EUREKA themselves also have reservations.

Diplomatic circles hasten to state categorically that they are in complete agreement with the French position according to which the technological chasm that separates Europe from Japan and the USA must be narrowed, but that does not mean that the following questions regarding the implementation of the program have been answered.

What actually does the French government mean when it mentions in its proposal for the development of technology that countries outside the European Community can participate? Are the Eastern countries of the Mediterranean included in the countries "outside" the Community? If so, the matter takes on a different dimension and connotation ...

How does the French government perceive the creation of a "Coordinating Organization of European Research"? In the French government proposal there is mentioned that this organization will have legal and financial autonomy, a fact that is interpreted by diplomatic circles as an indication of a trend to overlap the jurisdiction of the Council of Ministers of the European Community and the European Parliament. This will lead to a downgrading of the activity of the regulatory organs of the Community at a time when efforts to upgrade the role of every organ are being made.

What actually does it mean that in the research there will participate private firms and to what degree will their activities extend? Undoubtedly the participation of private firms is unavoidable, but the question is up to what point in view of the fact that only a few of them have the capabilities to participate and these are actually multinationals controlled by American capital. This fact is not censurable, of course, however, with the participation of such firms how "can we talk about autonomy of research in Europe"?

How does the French government understand that the exorbitant expenditures for the implementation of the program will be realized without there being economic results? It is a fact that France's proposal is not accompanied by a cost-profit analysis, not even by approximation. Such an analysis would have been indispensable, even if it were incomplete (and it would have been, as things are).

The questions, of course, do not end here. There are many others which have to do with the correlation of the forces between member-countries of the EEC, the time frame in which the French government chose to make the proposal and many others.

In summary, the proposal is not rejected, but is faced (and should be faced) with many reservations.

9731

CSO: 5200/2644

SALT/START ISSUES

PRAVDA WEEKLY REVIEW SEES U.S. ATTEMPTS TO CIRCUMVENT SALT II

PM210857 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 85 Second Edition p 4

[Igor Melnikov "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Our Course Is a Course of Peace and Creation

This week the Soviet space stations "Vega-1" and "Vega-2" have furnished earth's inhabitants with new information about Venus. One piece of information is that there are constant winds blowing on the surface of the Morning Star. And what winds -- 50 meters per second! The beautiful blue earth -- which is how it appears from space -- also has its own winds, including, unfortunately, the winds of the cold war as a result of which our beautiful planet indeed lives in a restless and anxious state.

U.S. imperialism is cranking up the arms race as never before and opening up new channels for it. For what purpose? Official Washington unrestrainedly declares: to "cast off" socialism and even destroy it. Under the standards of anticommunism, they have perpetrated atrocities, occupying Grenada; they have been and still are waging an undeclared war against Afghanistan; and they are organizing a total blockade of sovereign Nicaragua. Behind this sinister facade of U.S.-style state terrorism, the U.S. aspiration to erect an iron curtain in the way of progressive changes in the world can be plainly seen.

Even if, contrary to the saying, the imperialist cow that butts has acquired horns, and nuclear horns at that, the militarist adventurist plans are still not fated to be realized. They are not fated to be realized, primarily because the might of the world's first socialist country and its allies stands in the way of aggressive forces.

Year by year the socialist community strengthens, coordinating increasingly skillfully its efforts on the path of its creative development. This week is the first anniversary of the Moscow economic summit conference of CEMA countries. The past year has been a year of expansion of the scale and improvement of the effectiveness of their fraternal cooperation.

The Soviet Union stands firmly for detente. Socialism is not afraid of peaceful competition with capitalism; it is sure of its vitality and its advantages as a social system. The events of this week in our motherland's life also prove this. It is not for nothing that such great interest is being shown throughout the world in the conference on questions of accelerating scientific and technical progress held at the CPSU Central Committee. The party, profoundly believing in the creative forces of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia and the lofty moral spirit and will of our people, is getting down to tackling innovative labor tasks with optimism.

The creative character of the Soviet state's domestic policy is simultaneously reflected in its foreign policy, which dynamically upholds the cause of peace. Striving to live in peace and cooperation with all countries, the USSR pursues the Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence. This is evidenced by the Soviet initiatives in the international arena. Since 1982 the Soviet Union's unilateral pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has been in force, and since 1983 there has been a unilateral moratorium on being the first to put antisatellite weapons into space. Our country has come to the new dialogue in Geneva with proposals to introduce a mutual moratorium on creating space weapons and to freeze nuclear arsenals during the entire period of the talks. Continuing this line, the USSR has unilaterally declared a moratorium on deploying medium-range missiles and stepping up other countermeasures in Europe.

Everywhere, this step has been seen as an important and constructive step, promoting the success of the talks.

Our country and its allies have submitted new proposals at the forums in Stockholm and Vienna. The Soviet initiative on the problems of security in Asia have rightly met with a great response in the world.

In brief, the will of the Soviet people remains immutable. We must continue to make every effort to maintain peace and halt the arms race; at the same time, in the face of imperialism's aggressive policy and threats we must not permit military superiority over ourselves and must continue to strengthen defense.

Backing an Exhausted Horse

Recently a curious report spread around the West European press. The French ambassador to Spain and the mayor of the little town of Mostoles, which is near Madrid, signed a symbolic peace treaty. It put an end to a war declared...177 years ago on France and Napoleon's army by the then mayor of the tiny Spanish town.

The anecdote, even if it is historical, is still only an anecdote. One might think that Spain together with France and indeed the whole of Europe could have lived another 177 years without the Mostoles Treaty. It is much sadder and more dangerous to think that the largest capitalist power today, which is what the United States is, contrives to sign a treaty and then turns its back on it, a treaty which was seen by people as an important document for ensuring a peaceful and secure life for mankind.

To be specific, we are talking of the SALT-2 treaty signed, as is known, by the USSR and U.S. leaders in Vienna in June 1979, but which Washington then refused to ratify. However, its main provisions have been mutually observed in practice.

Recently, it has become obvious that the SALT-2 commitments are a real procrustean bed for the implementation of the Pentagon's far-reaching militarist programs. Reports have started to creep into the press with increasing frequency that the U.S. leadership is feverishly working on options on how to do away with the treaty restrictions. On the one hand, the option of Washington continuing to observe the treaty's provisions was rejected as unacceptable; on the other hand, some people in the administration were disturbed by immediate and outright abandonment of the commitments, for it would be simply too provocative in view of feelings in the United States itself, among the NATO allies, not to mention the world public.

For this reason, the White House decided not to tear the camouflaging olive branch from the Pentagon helmet at one go, and with assumed fervor started to assert that it also

advocates the elimination of nuclear weapons and that it is still prepared to treat its commitments like a gentleman. It was in this manner that R. Reagan made his 10 June statement about U.S. policy vis-a-vis existing treaties and agreements in the strategic arms limitation sphere.

The President laid it on thick, but the trouble is how to make words and deeds gel together, how to make millions of people on the planet, even in the United States itself, believe that genuine security and stability in the world can be strengthened by the massive buildup of all types of existing armaments and the militarization of space.

A TASS statement exposed the very clumsy and hackneyed lie about "treaty violations by the Russians." It is easy to understand why Washington resorts repeatedly to such fabrications. In this way it reserves the "right," so to speak, to violate key treaty provisions and, particularly, to create another strategic missile, the Midgetman, in addition to the MX missile.

However, the sins of the Washington "righteous" are hardly confined to this! They started, as has already been said, with the refusal to ratify the SALT-2 treaty. Then they cast aside the protocol as lightheartedly as if they were throwing out the bathwater, but they threw out the baby at the same time: According to the protocol, it was required to limit, if not ban, long-range cruise missiles. It was a sorry result for disarmament, for a new class of strategic arms appeared.

There was more to come. Circumventing the treaty, Washington and NATO set about deploying new medium-range nuclear missiles in West Europe. Now they are starting to develop the "star wars" program....

The Washington administration has become ensnared in lies. What does it care that the transparent "accusations" against the USSR do not stand up to contact with the facts the next day? The propaganda cowboys keep on saddling the exhausted horse of a lie. They have one hope: Even if it does not reach the finish, it will hopefully, even if only for a short time, divert world public opinion from the Pentagon's feverish militarist efforts.

CSO: 5200/1285

SALT/START ISSUES

HUNGARY ON U.S. SALT II STANCE

LD072259 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 2020 GMT 7 Jun 85

[Program commentary by Istvan Kulcsar: "Ten Minutes of Foreign Politics"]

[Excerpts] The Reagan administration will have to decide on an important issue this weekend: whether the United States should continue to adhere to the rules of the SALT II agreement. According to one of the rules of play between the legislative and the executive powers, Congress and the White House, the President was obliged to brief Congress about this by 1 June, but through his national security adviser he asked for 10 more days. This deadline will expire on Monday.

The question is not whether the United States should cancel the agreement with the USSR, but whether it should continue to adhere to it; for legally, of course, there exists no such agreement. Fortunately, however, in reality it does.

However, at the end of this year this piece of paper without a seal comes to the end of its validity. Even if not a reason in itself, the deadline does serve as an occasion for the United States to reconsider its further adherence to SALT II. The real situation at present is that in a few weeks a new Trident submarine, the Alaska, will be launched, in which 24 intercontinental ballistic missiles will be positioned. With these the United States will be exceeding the maximum number cited in the agreement.

On the other hand, Washington could instead withdraw from circulation and disarm an older-type submarine together with its missiles. Then it would not violate the SALT II agreement. A few missiles obviously make no difference because in the age of overkill capability they in no way upset the approximate strategic balance. Still it is a symbol, and even more than a symbol. It is a basic question of principle whether the United States is willing to stay within the existing limits of the arms race or whether it will step onto the path of acceleration.

As far as one can ascertain from the press reports, two directions have taken shape within the U.S. Administration. Defense Secretary Weinberger favors renouncing SALT II while Secretary of State Shultz and National Security Adviser MacFarlane, have taken a stand on the side of continuing to adhere to it, at least conditionally. The more moderate ones are backing their stances as follows: First, the Senate has officially asked the President not to cancel the agreement in operation. The White House, which because of next year's tax law is in any case at odds with Congress, really has no need to cross swords with it in this matter as well. Second, the United States' NATO allies, as has also become clear at the present foreign ministers meeting in Portugal, and the West European public in general would take it very ill if Washington took this step.

Third, stepping over the SALT II limits would have a very serious effect on the relations of the two world powers. It could ultimately lead to a deadlock of the Geneva talks, which are in any case going slowly, and would frustrate the planned USSR-U.S. summit meeting. Fourth, if the agreement fixing the ceiling of the strategic missiles were scrapped, it would probably be the USSR and not the United States that could gain a certain advantage in the deployment of the new intercontinental missiles.

The U.S. specialist press, and nowadays even the daily papers, write more and more frequently about two new and frightening Soviet missile systems, positioned on trucks and trains, which the USSR could quickly increase the number of if no longer limited by a mutual agreement.

Taking all this into consideration, few people expect that the Reagan administration will commit itself to invalidating SALT II, thereby throwing down the gauntlet not only to the USSR but also to domestic and international public opinion.

Of course, there is a different issue: that continued validation is not the only option. For example, one could continue to postpone the decision. But one can also conceive of a temporary solution, such as placing the out-of-date submarine in question in a dry dock but not scrapping it completely. In a word, the temporary, half solution we have had up till now could be turned into a half-temporary quarter solution, at least for the time being.

CSO: 5200/3062

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET MILITARY JOURNAL ON FRENCH SSBN FLEET

Moscow ZARUBEZHNOYE VOYENNOYE OBOZRENIYE in Russian No 4, Apr 85 (signed to press 11 Apr 85) pp 59-63

[Article by Capt 2d Rank S. Grechin under the rubric "Naval Forces": "French Nuclear-Powered Missile Submarines"]

[Excerpts] One of the most important components of France's strategic nuclear forces is the nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines (SSBN's), which in the estimate of western specialists account for over 60 percent of the nuclear weapon platforms. Considering the rather high effectiveness, survivability and mobility of the SSBN's, the country's military-political leadership is placing great emphasis on their further development and improvement.

The SSBN's as well as forces and assets of combat and logistical support were placed in an independent strategic ocean command in March 1972 by decision of the government. Judging from foreign press reports, this command is organizationally a part of the Navy and includes a squadron of SSBN's (five "Le Redoutable" Class submarines: four of them usually are combat-ready and one is undergoing regular major overhaul), a strategic ocean forces base and communications center at Rosnay.

The command headquarters is at Houilles (a suburb of Paris). The commander in chief is operationally subordinate to the Armed Forces chief of staff and administratively subordinate to the naval chief of staff, who is responsible for readiness of the SSBN's to perform assigned missions, for the organization of combat and logistical support, for manning and training the personnel of submarines and service subunits. "Le Redoutable" Class SSBN's fitted with M-20 missiles ~~comform~~ form the basis of the country's strategic ocean forces. All scientific research and development work connected with the development both of submarines and the ballistic missiles for them was performed by French specialists (under the Calacante program).

Work to develop the M-1 missile (single charge nuclear re-entry vehicle with a yield of 500 KT and a range of fire of 2,600 km) was begun in 1963. Flight tests of the missile system aboard the "Gymnote" and "Le Redoutable" submarines were conducted beginning in 1969, after which the M-1 was made operational in the first two SSBN's.

In 1974 the S610 "Le Foudroyant" was armed with the M-2 missiles with a range of fire up to 3,200 km (the re-entry vehicle remained unchanged).

The S613 "L'Indomptable" and S614 "Le Tonnant" were handed over to the Navy with the M-20 missiles. The missiles do not differ from the M-2 missiles in their principal combat characteristics, but they have a single charge thermo-nuclear re-entry vehicle with a 1 MT yield. Subsequently the M-20 missiles were also installed aboard the first three nuclear-powered submarines during major overhaul.

Work presently is being completed on development of the fundamentally new M-4 missile which, as the foreign press indicates, is made in a three-stage configuration and has an MRV multiple-charge dispensing re-entry vehicle (six 150 KT warheads). Subsequently it is planned to fit it with a MIRV (dispensing warhead re-entry vehicle (six 150 KT individually targeted warheads). The M-4 exceeds the M-20 in size, which permitted an increase in the amount of fuel and in range of fire by 1,000 km. In accordance with naval command plans, beginning in 1985 four SSBN's are to be refitted with the M-4 missiles at yards in the cities of Cherbourg and Brest, which will take around three years for each SSBN. It is planned to complete this work in the following time periods: 1987 for the S614 "Le Tonnant," 1989 for the S613 "L'Indomptable," 1990 for the S612 "Le Terrible," and 1992 for the S610 "Le Foudroyant." It is not planned to refit the S611 "Le Redoutable," since it is to be placed in reserve in 1996.

According to foreign press data, the French military-political leadership is placing great emphasis on a further build-up in the combat potential of the country's strategic nuclear forces. Emphasis is being placed not only on a quantitative growth in SSBN's, ballistic missiles and nuclear warheads, but also on their qualitative improvement.

Construction of a sixth SSBN, the S615 "L'Inflexible" armed with the M-4 missiles, was completed in accordance with plans for developing the country's Armed Forces for 1984-1988. The submarine was handed over to the Navy in early April of this year. It is also planned to begin construction of a seventh SSBN in 1988. This will be the first new-generation ballistic-missile submarine. In the opinion of foreign specialists, by the time it is commissioned (1994) it should be expected that a new M-5 sea-based ballistic missile or an improved M-4 missile will become operational.

As the western press emphasizes, commissioning of the new SSBN's and introduction of the M-4 (and possibly the M-5) missiles provide for a growth in tactical capabilities of the French strategic ocean forces. It is expected that the number of sea-based missiles will increase 1.4 times (from 80 to 112) and the number of nuclear warheads by 7.4 times (from 80 to 592) in the mid-1990's.

The strategic ocean forces base provides basing and logistical support for the SSBN's, storage and assembly of ballistic missiles, as well as training, accommodation and supply of all kinds of allowances for crew personnel. This includes the Ile Longue basing point and the Roche-Douvres training center.

The base commander is commander of the SSBN squadron. He is in immediate charge of the repair and preparation of submarines for departure on combat patrol.

Principal Stages in Construction of French Navy SSBN's

Number	Name	Principal Construction Stages				First Combat Patrol	Major Overhaul	
		Laid Down	Launched	Began Sea Trials	Operational		First	Second
S611	"Le Redoutable"	30 Mar 64	29 Mar 67	Jul 69	1 Dec 71	Jan 72	1974-1976	1980-1982
S612	"Le Terrible"	24 Jun 67	12 Dec 69	1971	1 Dec 73	Jan 73	1976-1978	1982-1983
S610	"Le Foudroyant"	12 Dec 69	4 Dec 71	May 73	6 Jun 74	Sep 74	1978-1980	1983-1984
S613	"L'Indomptable"	4 Dec 71	17 Aug 74	Dec 75	31 Dec 76	Feb 77	1980-1982	
S614	"Le Tonnant"	Oct 74	17 Sep 77	Apr 79	3 May 80	May 80		
S615	"L'Inflexible"	27 Mar 80	23 Jun 82	1983	1985			

The Ile Longue basing point, located on a peninsula of the Brest roads of the same name near the main naval base on the Atlantic at Brest, is a primary link in the SSBN logistical support system. Here there are various depots and two covered docks, each 200x30x30 m in size, intended for routine inspections and submarine repair between deployments. A reinforced concrete berth over 400 m long outfitted with water, air and power supply systems as well as cable telephone communications is used for anchoring the SSBN's. Storage areas for missiles and their nuclear warheads are located in the central part of the peninsula.

The SSBN crews are manned primarily by volunteers who have signed a contract for performing military duty for various time periods. Higher demands are placed on candidates of all categories in matters of political reliability, state of health, physical training, general development and education. Special emphasis is placed on the selection of officers and noncommissioned officers of the missile department.

Two equal crews ("blue" and "red") are formed for each SSBN. They receive the submarine and go out on combat patrol in turn. An SSBN crew includes 135 persons, including 15 officers and 120 noncommissioned officers and enlisted men. According to the foreign press, officers usually make no more than 12 combat patrols and then are transferred to other ships and to naval staffs and establishments.

The personnel's special training takes place in training centers at Roche-Douvres (the Brest main naval base) and Cherbourg. The training center at Roche-Douvres puts out specialists in missile and torpedo weapons and

operators of fire control systems and navigation and computer equipment. The center at Cherbourg trains engineering department personnel. The centers are outfitted with simulators, systems, and machinery permitting a study of the equipment under near-real conditions. It takes around 2½ years to form and train SSBN crews.

The foreign press reports that headquarters of the strategic ocean command exercises control over the SSBN's on combat patrol, during the sea passage and in combat training areas through a communications center at Rosnay (Indre Department) over very low frequency, which gets instructions to SSBN's in a submerged condition at a distance up to 9,000 km. The headquarters is connected by underground cable lines with main and alternate command posts of the Armed Forces and of the strategic naval command. Instructions also can be transmitted to submarines via alternate communications centers.

French SSBN's began combat patrols in January 1972 when the S611 "Le Redoutable" entered the Norwegian Sea for the first time. According to western press data, they had made some 130 combat patrols by the beginning of 1985. The work cycle of each combat-ready SSBN consists of 9-10 weeks on combat patrol and four weeks in base for restoring combat readiness. In combat patrol areas the SSBN maneuvers at slow speed at a depth down to 30 m, which allows receiving control and radio navigation signals. At this time the SSBN constantly maintains readiness to launch missiles, which can be done only after the president makes a decision to employ nuclear weapons.

A mass nuclear strike is the principal method of SSBN combat activity. In the opinion of foreign specialists, attack targets can be administrative and industrial centers, naval and air bases, ports, transportation centers, major enemy troop groupings, and important military-industrial installations. It is also reported that later, as missiles with a higher accuracy of fire are introduced, the SSBN's also may be employed to destroy small hardened targets.

The presence of France's own strategic ocean forces and the development of plans for their quantitative growth and qualitative improvement indicate the desire of the French military-political leadership to occupy an important place in the system of militaristic preparations by the aggressive NATO bloc in which it is a participant.

COPYRIGHT: "Zarubezhnoye voyennoye obozreniye", 1985.

6904

CSO: 1801/230

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

PRAVDA EDITORIAL ARTICLE ON EUROMISSILES, GENEVA TALKS

LD191604 Moscow TASS in English 1552 GMT 19 Jun 85

[TASS translation of an editorial article published in Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 20 June 1985 on page 4: "Export of the American Nuclear Threat to Europe-- A Danger to Universal Peace"]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS -- Follows an article published in the June 20th issue of the newspaper PRAVDA:

Western Europe holds a special place in Washington's strategic military plans. Already in the first post-war years the ruling circles of the United States made a massive effort to turn the territory of West European states into a jumpoff area for their military preparations. It was this policy of the United States that was the initial cause of Europe's division into opposing military-political groupings.

Washington pursued this course under the pretext of ensuring the security of its allies from the mythical "threat" from the East. But in reality the purpose of this course was to consolidate American leadership among developed capitalist states, to use Western Europe as a sort of bridgehead, an advanced frontier to promote a policy of confrontation in respect of the socialist countries, the notorious "atomic diplomacy".

It was exactly for these purposes that by Washington's efforts a ramified network of military bases and strongpoints was created in Western Europe in direct proximity of the borders of the socialist community. 90 American B-29 strategic bombers carrying atomic bombs were stationed on the territory of Britain in 1948. Somewhat later, the American "Thor" and "Jupiter" ballistic missiles were deployed in Western Europe. The NATO bloc, a source of growing tension and military danger not only in Europe but also throughout the world, was created in 1949.

Washington has given and continues to give direct assistance to the buildup of Britain's nuclear potential. The "Dreadnaught", the first British nuclear submarine, was built in 1960 with American assistance. American-built nuclear-capable bombers with a range enabling them to reach Soviet territory were handed over to the British Air Force.

As a result of the saturation of Western Europe with nuclear arms about 7,000 American nuclear munitions alone are now concentrated there. Not counting the British and French ones. American aircraft carriers and missile-firing nuclear submarines with hundreds of nuclear warheads on board are constantly sailing in the seas and oceans surrounding the European Continent. But all this seemed not enough to the strategists in Washington.

Starting with the mid-1970s development work began in the United States to create the "Pershing-2" intermediate range ballistic missile. Parallel to this, work was in full swing to create long-range cruise missiles, with Western Europe being slated as one of the areas of their deployment.

It is noteworthy that all this was being done before the SS-20 missiles appeared in the Soviet Union, the missiles that are the subject of such an outcry in the West and which American propaganda tries to portray as the cause of the decision on nuclear-missile "rearmament" adopted by the NATO block in December 1979. But what happened in reality was the fulfilment of a long-conceived plan of deploying in Western Europe American first-strike missiles capable of reaching targets on the territory of the USSR and its allies within a matter of minutes.

It is characteristic that this plan was being hatched and implemented despite the fact that the SALT-2 talks were being held at the time with the aim of fixing a rough strategic military balance between the USSR and the United States at a substantially lower level. When planning the deployment of their new missiles in Europe the people in Washington were giving advance thought to a method of sidestepping the SALT-2 accords in the hope of gaining unilateral military advantages.

For this reason the present American Administration viewed the talks on medium-range nuclear arms in Europe, that were held in Geneva from 1981 to the end of 1983, only as an obstacle to the fulfilment of this plan. The proposals made by it at the talks were of an openly one-sided nature and were directed not at reaching agreement but at frustrating the talks. As a result, the talks in Geneva were deadlocked. By starting in November 1983 the deployment of the "Pershing-2s" and cruise missiles in Western Europe the United States deliberately aimed at breaking up the talks on nuclear arms limitation in Europe.

Already 72 American "Pershing-2s" have been deployed by now on the territory of the FRG. 112 long-range ground-launched cruise missiles have been stationed in Britain, Italy and Belgium. In other words, a further cramming of Western Europe with nuclear explosives, in addition to the thousands of nuclear munitions mounted on NATO's medium-range delivery vehicles already existing there, is taking place contrary to public protests (according to public opinion polls in Belgium, for instance, three out of every four polled oppose the deployment of the American missiles).

The American propaganda thesis that this supposedly is being done to counter the threat posed by Soviet medium-range systems does not withstand a confrontation with facts. NATO even has an advantage at present both as regards medium-range delivery vehicles -- missiles and aircraft -- and the warheads carried by them. More than that, its superiority in warheads is 1.5 to 1. So the USSR's certain advantage in the number of warheads carried by medium-range missiles does not change the overall picture or rough parity as regards the total number of nuclear medium-range weapon systems.

Hence it is clear that the course of the United States of deploying its missiles in Western Europe is a continuation of the course of wrecking the existing approximate parity in an attempt to gain superiority. The strengthening of stability in Europe is the least of Washington's concerns. It counts on getting a chance to carry out a nuclear aggression while "limiting" it to the confines of the eastern hemisphere and sparing the United States from the consequences of the nuclear conflagration. The sinister nature of these plans becomes more obvious considering the directedness of the American programme to create a large-scale ABM system with elements of space basing. On the one hand, a "shield" is planned for the United States to protect it

from the Soviet return strike while, on the other hand, American first-strike nuclear systems are being deployed on the very doorstep of the Warsaw Treaty member states. Preconditions for aggression are being created or, in any case, for subjecting the European peoples to nuclear blackmail. So in practical terms Washington's "concern" for the interests of its allies takes the form of creating new dangers to the European peoples, to the peoples of all continents.

The Soviet Union, of course, has all that it needs to foil these dangerous plans of the United States. The USSR will not allow anyone to wreck the parity, and our reply measures, taken in connection with the deployment of the new American missiles in Europe, are patent evidence of this.

The people in Washington must understand at long last that the policy of the arms race, of raising the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe is barren and holds no promise of any political or military dividends.

It encounters the mounting resistance of the European peoples. Security cannot be strengthened by piling up more and more mountains of armaments. Right now the opposite is needed -- to stop the arms race, first of all the nuclear arms race, and reverse it.

This is exactly what the Soviet Union stands for at the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms. It came to the talks with a clear and precise position, including on questions concerning nuclear arms in Europe. The USSR is for totally freeing Europe from both medium-range and tactical nuclear arms. Such a step would be an effective contribution to averting war and strengthening peace. But if the West does not want such a radical solution the Soviet side is prepared to reach agreement on measures of substantially reducing medium-range nuclear arms to agreed-upon levels on the basis of reciprocity and in strict conformity with the principle of equality and equal security.

The Soviet Union confirms its proposals for a fair settlement of the question of medium-range nuclear arms. As a result of their fulfillment neither the USSR nor the United States would have any confronting medium-range missiles in Europe. As to such Soviet missiles remaining in the European zone, their number and the number of warheads mounted on them would not exceed even by one the number of missiles and warheads possessed by Britain and France. In the event of an agreement the Soviet missiles subject to reduction would be scrapped and also the deployment of SS-20 missiles in the eastern areas of the USSR would be stopped given, of course, that there are no substantial changes in the strategic situation in the Asian region.

In order to create more favourable conditions for the attainment of accords of this score the USSR proposed to the United States to reach agreement on the immediate discontinuation by the United States of the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe and on the simultaneous discontinuation of the buildup of Soviet reply measures. The USSR backed up this proposal with an important political action by unilaterally imposing a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the implementation of other reply measures in Europe.

Now the ball is on the American side of the court. And the haste with which the White House took a negative stand in respect of the new Soviet initiative is surprising, to say the least. In this response of the United States there is nothing remotely resembling a serious, responsible approach to the important problem of limiting and reducing medium-range nuclear arms. The people in Washington like to speak about their striving to limit nuclear arms. But when it comes to practical deeds they avoid imposing a moratorium and do not want to stop the medium-range nuclear arms race in Europe.

The Soviet Union is doing all it can to make the talks in Geneva a success. It is necessary for the American side to adjust its position bringing it strictly in line with the January 8, 1985 accord between the USSR and the United States on the subject-matter and aims of the Geneva talks. A businesslike search for really mutually acceptable practical solutions of the questions under discussion, including the problem of saving Europe from nuclear arms, will be possible only in that event.

CSO: 5200/1278

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

USSR: BLOC PROPOSALS PRAISED, NATO PROPOSALS CRITICIZED

AU261145 Moscow MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 6, Jun 85 (signed to Press 21 May 85) pp 48-54

[Article by N. Yuryev: "For a Europe of Confidence and Security"]

[Text] On 14 May the next session of the Conference on Confidence Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe began in Stockholm. The activity of this conference is mainly concentrated in two working groups, where delegations from 35 countries are examining problems of both a political and a military nature.

The success of this important international forum, which opened on 17 January 1984, would indubitably make a vital contribution to resolving the urgent task of improving the political climate in Europe and in the world as a whole. The necessity of this is particularly keenly felt in the present complex situation when increased international tension and the threat of a nuclear catastrophe remain with us. The arms race, with all its dangerous consequences, continues to gather momentum and threatens to spill over into outer space.

However, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are convinced that it is not only possible, but also urgently necessary to change the international situation for the better. For this to happen the United States and its allies must take counter-steps in the direction of halting the arms race, radically improving the international situation, and strengthening peace. The Stockholm Conference opens broad opportunities for showing good will in this direction.

At the December 1984 session of the Committee of Ministers of Foreign Affairs held in Berlin, the Warsaw Pact member-states spoke in favor of conducting the talks in Stockholm in a constructive spirit and reaching vital agreements there on confidence building and security measures in Europe in both the political and military spheres. It is totally clear that such agreements, as envisaged by the conference mandate, must be based on equal rights, balance and reciprocity, and equal respect for the security interests of all signatory countries. "We want the work of the forum in Stockholm to be productive and crowned with success," said A.A. Gromyko in a speech to voters on 19 February this year.

The socialist countries persistently strive in practice to improve the dangerous situation that has taken shape in Europe as a result of the deployment of new American intermediate-range missiles. Major practical steps must be taken in order to reduce the danger of a military conflict and to really build confidence and strengthen the security of countries on the European Continent. In this lies the essence of the important and constructive proposals introduced by the USSR at the Stockholm forum.

Based on the joint initiatives of the socialist states, these proposals proceed from the broad concept of security embodied in the Helsinki Final Act and in the mandate of the Stockholm Conference, and they answer vital needs of all countries on the European Continent. These proposals organically combine confidence and security measures of both a political and military nature, as also envisaged by the Helsinki agreements on the "indivisibility of security in Europe" and the "complementary nature of the political and military aspects of security."

It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Union and other socialist countries place such large-scale political proposals at the center of attention of the Stockholm Conference as not being the first to use nuclear weapons and concluding a treaty on rejecting the use of military force, freeing Europe from chemical weapons, not increasing, but reducing military expenditure, and forming nuclear-free zones in various regions of the European Continent.

The obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons acquires particular significance in the contemporary international situation. This proposal concerns all the participant states, because it is aimed at defending a basic human right -- the right to life -- and at avoiding the nuclear danger, which is fraught with catastrophic consequences for all mankind. In the nuclear age not one state has the right to shut itself off from the struggle against the threat of nuclear war on the ground that this problem is supposedly the affair of nuclear powers alone. In actual fact this problem affects the vital interests of every country and every people. Suffice it to recall that Europe is literally stuffed with nuclear weapons, while ships and submarines equipped with nuclear weapons ply the seas and oceans surrounding it. All states -- both nuclear and non-nuclear -- share an equal interest in the adoption of the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and in its unconditional observance. Guided by this, the Soviet Union has introduced a corresponding proposal in Stockholm.

However, objections have been raised against this proposal at the conference: It could supposedly undermine the NATO concept of deterrence, which is based on the first use of nuclear weapons. True, Washington has recently tried to assure people that the United States does not aspire to the first use of nuclear weapons, but if this is really so, it is all the more incomprehensible why the United States still opposes the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons.

As the representatives of certain NATO countries claim, discussion of this issue supposedly goes beyond the bounds of the Stockholm Conference mandate. In actual fact there is no indication in its text that issues relating to the nuclear threat should not be examined. It states that the measures to be coordinated at the conference will embrace all military activity affecting security in Europe. Surely the use of nuclear weapons relates to military activity. Surely nuclear weapons are not beyond the bounds of Europe and surely they threaten the security of its peoples?

The far-fetched arguments against the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons cannot, of course, be convincing. In reality such a step would signify concrete expression of the states' responsibility not to use force, and, what is more, the most terrible and barbaric form of force. By helping to reduce the risk of a most dangerous military confrontation in Europe -- nuclear confrontation -- it would also reduce the risk of our continent being turned into a theater of nuclear war. Implementation of this proposal would help to strengthen the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, make nuclear blackmail impossible, increase the growing awareness everywhere that nuclear war is inadmissible, and finally, make it possible to prevent the possibility of either accidental or unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons.

Thus, the Soviet initiative is a most important confidence-building measure. The same opinion is also shared by a number of competent Western specialists in international affairs.

Research into this problem which has been carried out by the Brookings Institute (the United States) regards rejection of the first use of nuclear weapons as a measure which "would really help to build confidence in relations between East and West, and also between Western countries." (Footnote 1) (Alliance Security: NATO and the No-First-Use Question, the Brookings Institute, Washington, 1983, p 187).

A number of well-known political and military figures from NATO countries also speak in favor of the aforementioned proposal. They include former U.S. secretary of Defense R. McNamara, former Canadian Prime Minister P. Trudeau, British Field Marshal Lord Carver, Generals G. Bastian, Krause, Loser, and others. Italy's former permanent representative to NATO, V. Tornetta, has called for a revision of NATO strategy in this matter. (Footnote 2) [The WASHINGTON QUARTERLY, Summer 1984, p 16]. The idea of the obligation not to be the first to use nuclear weapons has been approved by many influential parties and organizations -- the West German SPD, the British Labor Party, the Synod of the Anglican Church, the American Catholic Bishops, and so forth. On 2 May 1984 the Danish Folketing spoke in favor of concluding precisely such an agreement.

At the same time the expediency of taking the obligation on oneself of not being the first to use nuclear weapons gives rise to doubt in some Western circles, because a war, they say, can also be started with the use of conventional weapons. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have also taken this viewpoint into account. By coming forward with the initiative of agreeing on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of peaceful relations, they propose reaching agreement on the nonuse of both nuclear and conventional weapons and on the nonuse of military force in general. There can hardly be any doubt that an agreement reached in Stockholm on this score would assist a swing away from the policy of force and confrontation and toward a policy of peace and international cooperation, and that it would lead to a transformation of the entire system of international relations in a direction excluding the use of force between states.

In the proposal put forward by the socialist countries it is not simply a question of purely declarative confirmation of the principle of the nonuse of force, but of an important confidence and security measure in compulsory form. We are not proposing the simple repetition of this principle in the form in which it is expounded in the UN Statute and the Final Act, but of its further development and consolidation as envisaged by the Helsinki agreements and the Stockholm Conference mandate. The Final Act directly obliges the signatory states to implement the principle of the nonuse of force "by every means and in every form," and, consequently, also in treaty form, in order to make it a law and norm of international life.

Putting these clauses of the Final Act in concrete forms, the participants in the Madrid meeting recognized the importance in their final document of the principles adopted in Helsinki being reflected in "treaties and agreements." Accordingly, the Stockholm Conference mandate, which is a component part of the Madrid agreements, states that the conference must "reflect the duty of states to restrain from the use of force or the threat of force in their mutual relations."

Showing flexibility in its approach to this problem, on 29 January 1985 the Soviet Union introduced a new document -- "Basic Principles of the Treaty on the Mutual Nonuse of

Military Force and the Maintenance of Peaceful Relations." Its aim is to consolidate and make concrete the principle of the nonuse of force at the contemporary stage of development in interstate relations.

In this respect the wishes and considerations of Western countries were taken into account, in particular concerning the holding of consultations, measures to prevent the danger of a sudden attack, and so forth. The pivotal clause in the proposed treaty, it is emphasized in the address by the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers "To the Peoples, Parliaments, and Governments of All Countries" on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the end of World War II, would be the obligation not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons against one another and, consequently, not to use military force against one another at all.

However, unfortunately representatives of the United States and their allies state that a treaty form of consolidating the principle of the nonuse of force is unacceptable to them. In point of fact, their position amounts to it being only the possibility to confirm the principle of the nonuse of force in some form at the conference that is not excluded, and that only when agreements on military-technical measures have been reached which satisfy the Western countries. Of course, this approach does not correspond to the sense of the conference mandate.

Attempting to somehow justify their negative attitude toward the ideas of a treaty on the nonuse of military force, some NATO delegates say that it supposedly does not contain anything new and that analogous treaties have already been signed in the past. In actual fact deficiencies of no small importance were inherent in former treaties on the nonuse of military force, including the Kellogg-Briand Pact which played a role in forming the principle of the nonuse of force. They placed the main emphasis on international-legal and moral-political guarantees of observing this principle, while little attention was devoted to material and other guarantees of state security.

That is why the USSR proposal is a new word in the sphere of international law and international practice, which develops the multifaceted process of strengthening security and cooperation begun in Helsinki. By confirming and making concrete the principle of the nonuse of force, which forms the normative base of safeguarding states' security, this proposal envisages the obligation to make efforts to prevent a space arms race, halt the nuclear and conventional arms race, limit and reduce arms, and achieve disarmament.

Implementation of the Soviet proposal would lead to tangible and positive changes in the international political climate and would be an important step on the path to further developing the all-European process. The necessity of reaching agreement on this highly topical issue is realized by broader and broader circles of the European public, including a number of socialist parties. Thus, a program document of the Labor Party of Great Britain states that members of the Labor Party support the reaching of agreement on the renunciation of the use of force, be it nuclear or non-nuclear. A SPD document on Western policy issues in the armaments sphere adopted on 1 June 1983 urges a "positive response to the proposal of the Warsaw Pact countries to conclude an agreement on the renunciation of the use of force comprises the core of the policy of detente."

To create an atmosphere of trust and strengthen security -- this is also the aim of proposals submitted by the socialist countries, such as freeing Europe from chemical weapons and, first and foremost, not deploying these weapons where none exist at present, as well as not increasing military expenditure and subsequently reducing it.

In conditions where the talks in Geneva on the banning of chemical weapons are marking time, resolving the task of freeing Europe of chemical weapons acquires increasing significance. "If global agreement cannot be reached in the near future, interested states could examine the possibility of taking the initiative at regional level with the aim of ensuring their own security requirements," (Footnote 3) (ETUDES INTERNATIONALES, Mar 82, p 107) thinks the well-known Canadian researcher, Professor G. Vachon.

Similar opinions are voiced in the West regarding the socialist countries' proposal to reduce military budgets on a regional basis. For example, J. Coffey, an American specialist on the problems of arms limitation, wrote in this connection that the public in Western countries regards this proposal as a "means of restraining the military and reducing its role as an instrument of foreign policy." (Footnote 4) (J. Coffey, Arms Control and European Security, London, The International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1977, p 197).

Turning northern Europe in to a nuclear-free zone, forming a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans, and forming a zone free of nuclear weapons in Europe on either side of the line of contact of the Warsaw Pact and NATO states -- proposals of this kind are directly connected with reducing the level of the danger of war and with building confidence. If the forum in Stockholm contributed to the adoption of these proposals, which are now supported by a number of European states, this would doubtless meet with a very broad response and enhance the significance and prestige of the conference, the work of which is at the center of attention of the European and international public. The proposals for nuclear-free zones in Europe are confidence-building and security measures that are militarily important and that are expected to reduce the risk of military confrontation. S. Lodgard, who is one of the authors of the work "Nuclear Disengagement in Europe" prepared by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), and who shares this opinion, notes that nuclear-free zones in the north and south of Europe "would primarily be confidence-building measures". (Footnote 5) ("Nuclear Disengagement in Europe". London-New York, SIPRI, 1983, p 8) The adoption of such measures, he considers, would reduce the risk of military confrontation and sudden attack in Europe.

The work of I. Holst, the director of the Norwegian Institute of International Relations (Oslo), stress that the proposals for nuclear-free zones are confidence-building measures that should be developed at the Stockholm Conference. In the "Bulletin of Peace Proposals" he writes, in particular: "The creation of zones free of nuclear weapons in the north of Europe could be linked with confidence-building measures... Such confidence-building measures could be discussed within the framework of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe, which will discuss problems of security all over Europe, including the adjacent ocean regions." (Footnote 6) (bulletin of peace proposals) vol. 14, No. 3, p 234)

The constructive position of the socialist countries on this question corresponds to the aspirations of wide political and social circles in a number of countries of Europe, which advocate the formation of nuclear-free zones in various parts of the continent.

Among the proposals submitted by the socialist countries at the Stockholm Conference, an important place is occupied by the measures to build confidence in the military sphere, which are of a more substantial nature and of a wider scope than those adopted earlier on the basis of the Helsinki Final Act.

An agreement to limit the scale of exercises to a definite number of participating troops would also be very timely. It is not easy to distinguish contemporary large military exercises from the preparatory stages of deployment of armed forces for the start of combat operations in the European theater. As they are conducted according to a common plan and under a joint command over vast expanses of land from the Norwegian to the Mediterranean Sea, and involve bringing large contingents of various services of the armed forces to combat readiness, they cannot but cause tension, alarm, and suspicion, even when there is advance notification. With this in mind, on 7 February the delegations of Bulgaria, the GDR, and the Soviet Union submitted proposals for limiting the scale of military exercises.

Meeting half-way the desire of the Western delegations to engage in discussions on notification of military activity, the delegation of the CSSR, on behalf of the delegations of the Polish People's Republic and the CSSR, made a proposal to send such notification on upwards of 20,000 men and 30 days in advance. The Soviet proposals on advance notification of large air and naval operations conducted in Europe and the adjacent sea, ocean, and air spaces, also correspond to the interests of building confidence.

The most serious attention is also deserved by the question of notification of large maneuvers and transfers of troops, which are carried out by various forms of land, air, and sea transport, and which can cause suspicion, represent a threat to security, and be one of the signs of preparation for war.

It goes without saying that complex questions touching on sensitive aspects of each participant-state's security are being discussed at the forum in Stockholm. But it will be possible to achieve success here, too, if the proposed measures take into account the delicacy of security questions and do not themselves give rise to any doubts that someone intends to use the conference to achieve one-sided advantages of any sort. It is necessary to balance the agreement in such a way that no one state or group of state receives any one-sided advantages and no harm is done to the security of any of the sides. Strict observation of this principle is the most important condition for the effectiveness of the negotiations and for the viability of the agreements which are developed. However, the constructive proposals of the socialist countries have not as yet received a positive response from the NATO countries.

On 8 March the NATO countries submitted a "new" document on confidence-building and security measures, from the content of which it is clear that there is nothing new in it and that the considerations expressed by the socialist, neutral, and non-aligned states have not been taken into account. The majority of its provisions are aimed at revealing the military activity of the Warsaw Pact countries and at receiving one-sided military advantages. As before, they do not correspond to the demand of equality of rights, balance and reciprocity, and equal respect for the security of all participant states. They do not correspond to the task of ensuring the genuine security of European countries, either.

The questions of information and verification are unjustly over-emphasized in the NATO proposals. As follows from the practice of international relations in the sphere of ensuring international security, and also from the Final Act and other international documents, the building of mutual confidence is furthered only by strict correspondence of the information provided to the nature and scale of the agreed concrete confidence-building and security measures. Information about military activity in isolation from the concrete measures limiting it and promoting disarmament would in fact serve only the aims of intensifying the arms race and legalizing it.

The same considerations also apply to attempts to turn verification into an end in itself, and into almost a separate confidence-building measure. This is incompatible with the mandate of the conference. Verification should be carried out in forms and on a scale corresponding to each concrete measure and in accordance with the agreement reached on that count in connection with the given measure. Manipulation of the problem of verification can only give rise to the question of whether they do not want to block the achievement of positive results in Stockholm in this manner, as has already been done more than once with the aim of preventing agreement on arms limitation.

As we see, the American-NATO proposals do not contain large-scale measures capable in practice of strengthening confidence and security in Europe. Neither do they envisage measures to limit military activity, and they leave outside their scope military activity in the sea (ocean) region and air space adjacent to Europe, which is stipulated in the mandate. These proposals have been gathered into a single package in which provisions containing elements of confidence-building measures and provisions which go beyond the framework of the conference's mandate and undermine the foundations of the Helsinki Final Act are bound up in a tight knot. The countries of the West have resorted to such rigid correlation, or the "diplomacy of coordination", in the past, too, wishing to brake the progress of various negotiations.

It stands to reason that now, as in the past, the attempts by the representatives of NATO countries to gain one-sided advantages and concessions in Stockholm without taking into account the legitimate security interests of other participant states are completely hopeless and conflict with the conference's basic task of achieving mutually acceptable agreements aimed at building confidence and strengthening security in Europe.

In making major constructive proposals in Stockholm, the socialist countries, for their part, proceed from the fact that the capitalist countries need the preservation of peace, the halting of the arms race, and the prevention of war, primarily nuclear war, no less than do the Soviet Union and its friends. In their address "To the Peoples, Parliaments, and Governments of All Countries", the CPSU Central Committee, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers called on the governments of the European states, the United States, and Canada to undertake effective steps to completely cleanse Europe of nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical. Europe should be liberated from chemical weapons, too. The creation of nuclear-free zones in the Balkans and the north of Europe, and other regions of the continent, and not increasing but reducing military expenditure would contribute to the strengthening of peace and security here.

The Soviet Union calls on the states participating in the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe and also in the Vienna negotiations on the mutual reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe to take without delay the necessary measures to achieve mutually acceptable agreements.

The Stockholm forum is a component of the all-European process which 10 years ago led to the signing in Helsinki of the Final Act, still a vital source which nurtures the trends toward mutual understanding and cooperation on our continent, and not only here. The vital interests of the European peoples insistently demand continuation further along the path laid down in Helsinki.

COPYRIGHT: Obshchestvo "Znaniye", "Mezhdunaródnaya zhizn", 1985.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

SOVIET REPORTS ON OPENING OF SUMMER SESSION

Commentary Attacks U.S.

LD232201 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 23 Jun 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by international affairs journalist Tomas Kolesnichenko, with Geneva correspondent Gennadiy Vedenyapin]

[Text] The International Conference on Disarmament has opened its summer session at the Geneva Palais des Nations.

[Begin Gennadiy Vedenyapin recording] It used to be known as the Committee on Disarmament and was set up more than 25 years ago. Over the time this organization has been in existence the number of member-states has risen from 10 to 40. Taking part are representatives of the five nuclear powers, of all major military states. Socialist, developing, and capitalist countries are represented here on a balanced basis, which creates good requisites for solving major problems of disarmament and limitation of the arms race.

From the very beginning, the Soviet Union has taken a most active part in the work of the Geneva forum. Thanks to the constructive stance of our country and the other socialist states the conference has succeeded in achieving certain positive results. The effectiveness of the work of the conference could, of course, be far higher but for the opposition on the part of Washington and its allies, which are blocking the achievement of accords on key questions on the agenda. One such central problem is not allowing the militarization of space.

At the last session, through the efforts of the socialist countries, a committee designed to study specific questions of preventing the militarization of space was set up. This important international forum must fulfill the task it has been given. All that is needed is a mutual will toward reaching an accord on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security. [end recording]

The session is also discussing problems of banning chemical and radiological weapons. No less acute is the question of a full and universal ban on testing nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union and the socialist countries advocate that talks on this question should lead to the conclusion of a treaty that would create a serious obstacle for the further perfecting of nuclear armaments, would create favorable prerequisites for reducing nuclear arsenals, and would bring a positive influence to bear on strengthening the regulations on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

However, success is still a long way off. The tactics used by the Western states, most of all the United States and its NATO allies, at the conference consist in leading the talks into an impasse, and, having put the blame on the socialist countries, starting a new spiral in the arms race on earth and in space.

Precisely the same thing is taking place now also at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments that are also being held in Geneva. Progress is so far not in sight and we are not to blame. Let us take the problem of the limitation and reduction of medium-range nuclear armaments. In word Washington would appear to be saying that it is striving to limit nuclear armaments, while in deed it is evading the moratorium proposed by the Soviet Union and does not wish to halt the buildup of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

West Europe in general occupies a special place now in Washington's military-strategic plans.

The United States sees in it a bridgehead for its military adventures. It is not fortuitous that at present some 7,000 units of American nuclear ammunition are concentrated in Western Europe. On FRG territory alone 72 U.S. Pershing II missiles have already been deployed. With regard to our country these are a strategic weapon.

The FRG leadership is increasingly stuffing its territory with American nuclear explosives and has turned into a bearer of Washington's most dangerous ambitions designed to achieve nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. I have in mind Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, i.e. his "star wars" plans. All this cannot but create a certain climate in the FRG itself. The revanchists are again rearing their heads.

Auxiliary Committee on Space Arms

LD241641 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 24 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 24 TASS -- The first meeting of the new auxiliary body of the Geneva Disarmament Conference, a special committee on the question of the prevention of the arms race in outer space, was held here today. Emphasizing the priority importance of the problem, Viktor Israelyan, the head of the Soviet delegation at the disarmament conference, said that the exploration and use of outer space must serve exclusively peaceful purposes and that this is quite a feasible aim. Instead of inventing new types of arms, including space arms, it is necessary to conduct urgent and businesslike talks to work out effective arrangement aimed at the prevention of the arms race in space and terminating it on earth.

Comment on Its Purpose

LD242213 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jun 85

[Commentary by Viktor Levin]

[Text] A special committee on preventing an arms race in space has begun work in Geneva. The UN Disarmament Conference decided to set it up 1 year ago. Here is a news commentary with Viktor Levin at the microphone:

The very fact that this committee has been set up is a reflection of the international community's profound alarm over the U.S. plans to extend the arms race to space. The overwhelming majority of states represented at the UN realize that the creation of space weapons undermines the possibility of achieving agreement on limiting the arms race on earth and greatly increases the danger of war.

The choice we face has been made absolutely clear by life itself: Either weapons will be kept out of space -- in this event it will be possible to take specific and decisive steps to limit and reduce nuclear and, indeed, convention armaments -- or else the arms race will become uncontrollable and unlimited with all the consequences arising from that. The view that weapons have no place in space has been expressed repeatedly at the UN Disarmament Conference. When the new Soviet-U.S. talks on space and nuclear weapons began in Geneva, UN circles expressed hope that these talks would lead to decisions in the interest of stronger peace. This was particularly so in view of the fact that the Soviet Union and the United States had reached an accord that the problems of space and nuclear armaments would be examined on an interrelated basis.

Now, however, optimism over the Soviet-U.S. talks has markedly faded. The reason for this is the stubborn reluctance of the U.S. side to work toward the banning of space weapons. In an attempt to divert criticism away from Washington's negative position, the U.S. delegation is now trying to blame the Soviet Union for the situation at the talks, but the Soviet Union's position is strictly and consistently in line with the accord reached with the United States on the subject and objectives of the Geneva talks. Strategic arms and medium-range nuclear weapons are indeed being discussed by separate groups, but agreement can only be reached on the entire range of questions included in the Geneva agenda. This fundamental position is shared by many states of the world. Undoubtedly, this will also be made clear during the work of the special committee on preventing an arms race in space.

CSO: 5200/1300

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

CZECHOSLOVAK CORRESPONDENT REPORTS ON STATE OF TALKS

AU261423 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 21 Jun 85 p 7

[Bedrich Zagar Vienna dispatch: "The West Sticks to the Abstract Plane: the 399th Meeting at the Vienna Talks"]

[Text] The 399th meeting of the NATO and Warsaw Pact delegations participating in the talks on the reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe was held in the Vienna Hofburg yesterday.

The only speaker yesterday was Ambassador Marcel Rymenans, the Belgian delegation head, who once again, just like his colleagues from the delegations of NATO countries in the past, dealt with marginal affairs instead of addressing the real issue: the reduction of troops. He voiced the demand for some sort of a "clear picture" about the reduction process, the numerical expression of every future reduction phase, and its strict verifiability, and in the end he spoke about the need to recognize exceptions for the West.

The speech of the Belgian ambassador as well as the subsequent press conference, such as is held after every day of negotiations, showed that the delegations of NATO countries are sticking to the position of avoiding the concrete solution of the problems of reduction and are instead pressing for discussions about abstract issues of secondary importance. John Karch, the press representative of NATO countries, announced at the press conference that the Western delegations "are studying" the socialist countries' proposals, which is why no official Western standpoint on these proposals has been made public to date.

Instead of seeking an agreement, the West is demanding, aside from new numerical data, exceptions that are supposedly essential for Western security. For reasons of geography it is allegedly essential that a "flexible level" of troops be recognized on the Western part, in view of fluctuation, rotation, and other reasons resulting from normal military activity. From the way in which the West formulates its demands, an uninitiated person would hardly comprehend their gist; the actual point of these demands is, in fact, to allow the West to change, and thus also to increase, the level of its troops. It would be assisted in achieving supremacy in this way. It will not be possible to accept such a demand.

The attempts to divert attention to peripheral measures, verification, and exceptions are nothing but a diplomatic way of delaying and rejecting a just agreement based on the principle of equality and equal security.

In the opinion of the socialist countries, the most important thing at the Vienna talks is to arrive at a concrete reduction of armed forces and arms in central Europe.

The path toward this aim is shown by the proposals of the Warsaw Pact countries, as a start, to reduce troop levels by 20,000 Soviet and 13,000 American soldiers and to freeze the other countries' troops and subsequently to go ahead with the general reduction, down to the agreed-upon ceiling of 900,000 soldiers on each side. The manner in which the two sides arrive at this level is up to them; what is important, however, is that once this ceiling is reached on both sides, it will be possible to begin control and verification.

Is this approach not simple and logical? It surely is. But the West proposes in reality an approach that is opposite in character. It is like making the final account before taking stock. After all, first it is necessary to bring about reduction; then it is possible to count, to control, and to verify. Why is the West so emphatically giving priority to peripheral "associated measures?" Above all, this provides a good opportunity to complicate the talks while appearing before the public "innocent" of the procrastinations and being able to blame the other side for the stagnation of the Vienna talks.

The socialist countries constantly stress at the talks that an agreement is possible, that the only thing that is needed for it is the goodwill of NATO countries, and especially the United States, the leading NATO power.

CSO: 5200/3063

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

U. S. PRODUCTION, USE OF BACTERIOLOGICAL ARMS ALLEGED

Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Apr 85 p 3

[Article by A. Konstantinov: "Humanity-- Inside Out"]

[Text] The Convention on Banning the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Supplies of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxic Weapons and on Their Destruction entered into effect 10 years ago. This international agreement was an important step on the path to eliminating one of the most barbarous types of weapons. The United States, however, has avoided fulfilling the provisions fixed in the convention and continues intensive development of biological weapons of destruction.

The American magazine NATION has published an article which says that the U. S. military department intends to demand and obtain 1.4 million dollars for "work with large quantities of deadly biological aerosols" within the framework of the program for developing chemical and biological weapons at the Dugway Proving Grounds (Utah).

The development of ways to employ bacteriological and chemical weapons has been placed on a scientific basis in the United States. Of course, it is difficult to call this occupation a science. However, there are quite a few "theoreticians" in the United States who seriously defend the legality, necessity and even the "humanity" of biological weapons. A graphic example of this is the book "Oruzheye zaftrashnego dnya" [Tomorrow's Weapons] by Geo. Rothschild, the former chief of the Chemical Branch. The retired general writes: "... It is difficult to understand why we must reject the use of any weapon which could give us maximum advantage." The author's reference to the fact that toxic weapons are used to carry out death sentences in several states in the United States serves as one of the conclusions in favor of the "humanity" of using them. As (Rotshil'd) thinks, the fact that the use of biological weapons will not lead to destruction, of course, serves as a substantial "plus."

After becoming acquainted with such "theories", the motives for the cynical deal, which was concluded after the world war between the American administration at the time and the group of Japanese war criminals from "Detachment No 731",

who had been engaged since the Thirties in developing bacteriological weapons, become understandable.

The "experience" in using plague, cholera, yellow fever, and typhus bacteria, which had been acquired by "Detachment No 731" during inhumane experiments on Mongol, Chinese, Soviet, and American civilians, was brought to the United States. Complete complexes for the mass production of deadly pathogenic organisms and toxins were built there. More than a dozen of these centers are known, including Edgewood and Fort Detrick in Maryland, Pine Bluff in Arkansas, Rocky Mountain in Colorado, Redstone in Alabama, and others.

The American army made wide use of biological weapons during the war in Korea. According to the testimony of the Japanese writer S. Morimura, the U. S. command developed and had begun to implement a plan for the complete contamination of the central part of the Korean peninsula with insects -- carriers of malaria, typhus and plague. They were released from airplanes over thickly settled areas, and lakes and rivers were contaminated with them in order to cause epidemics among the peaceful population. The employment methods for toxic weapons were improved during the "dirty war" in Indochina. A branch of Scientific Research Institute No 408 was transferred to Vietnam for this purpose.

Instances of the use of biological weapons by the United States during peacetime are also known. Cuba is among the countries that have experienced the effects of these barbarous actions. As the magazine ACTION has reported, plans for bacteriological subversive activity were developed in the CIA and the Pentagon immediately after the victory of the revolution on the island of freedom. In 1979, the "blue mold" disease (not previously encountered on Cuba but known in the United States since the Thirties) destroyed more than 85 percent of the tobacco crop; and in 1981 "sugar-cane rust" destroyed almost a third of all the areas sown with sugar-cane. The epidemic of "dengue-2" tropical fever, which spread through Cuba during the middle of 1981 carried away many human lives. There were more than a hundred children and old people among those who perished. According to the testimony of the American journalist S. Hirsch, the Pentagon and the CIA had conducted beforehand a number of experiments with dengue pathogenes in the laboratories of Fort Detrick and the W. Reed Institute in Washington.

According to data in the magazine BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, 15 projects for creating new components of biological weapons are now being worked on in American research centers, private laboratories and universities. These evil measures contradict the obligations of the United States under the permanent international convention on banning the development, production and stockpiling of reserves of bacteriological (biological) and toxic weapons and their destruction, which entered into effect in 1975 and which U. S. representatives have also signed.

8802

CSO: 1807/266

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

USSR: U.S. VIOLATES 1925 GENEVA CHEMICAL ARMS PROTOCOL

PM261339 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jun 85 First Edition p 3

[Article by A. Mozgovoy under the rubric "Lessons of History: Events and Documents": "Their Weapon Is 'Silent Death'"]

[Excerpt] The appearance of the means of mass destruction, which spare neither military nor the civilian population, is causing widespread protest. Sixty years ago, in June 1925, the Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous, or Other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare was opened for signing. Our country acceded to that international treaty in December 1927. Over 100 states are now party to it.

The Geneva protocol played and continues to play an important role in deterring the use of chemical weapons in war. However, it does not prohibit the development, production, or stockpiling of chemical warfare agents. For that reason the international community now faces the task of completely eliminating the danger of chemical war.

This task is topical also because the imperialist states, primarily the United States, are not only developing new types of chemical weapons and increasing their stocks but are also using them contrary to the provisions of the Geneva protocol. Suffice it to recall the U.S. aggression against the Indochinese peoples. From 1961 through 1975, the U.S. military dispersed over 72 million liters of toxic agents over Vietnam. As a result, 43 percent of forestland and 44 percent of arable land were affected just in the south of the SRV. People suffered above all. Over 2 million people were affected by poison and thousands died.

The U.S. military department is supplying chemical munitions to the dushmans, waging the war against people's Afghanistan, and to the Somocista counterrevolutionary gangs in Nicaragua.

Over 150,000 tons of toxic agents are now stockpiled in America's arsenals. That is enough to destroy all life on the planet many times over. But it is not enough for the Pentagon! The U.S. military department has begun implementing a "chemical rearmament" program. The implementation of that program over the next 5 years will cost \$10 billion, which will be spent on acquiring a further 5 million of the most up-to-date chemical munitions. That includes binary shells. The proposal is to stockpile them primarily in Western Europe where an additional 19,000 tons of "silent death" are planned for deployment.

President Reagan recently held a conference in the White House involving the members of chemical weapons commissions.

Perhaps the conference discussed the reduction of stocks of toxic munitions? Not at all. The main theme of the meeting was how to push through Congress more quickly and request for \$1.5 billion for the "chemical rearmament" of America in the next fiscal year.

The international public firmly opposes these plans, which are dangerous for the cause of peace. The Soviet Union has submitted a draft "Basic Provisions of a Convention on Prohibiting the Development, Production, and Stockpiling of Chemical Weapons and on Eliminating Them" to the United Nations. According to that document each state will assume a commitment that it will never under any circumstances develop, produce, or acquire them in any way and will not stockpile chemical weapons, store them, or hand them over to others. They must be completely destroyed.

The USSR and all the Warsaw Pact countries support initiatives on the creation of chemical-weapon free zones in different part of the world. Last year they proposed to the NATO states that Europe be freed of chemical weapons. Unfortunately, there was no reply. But the peoples of the Old World, like those on the other continents, are increasingly persistently demanding that "silent death" and other types of weapons of mass destruction be banned.

CSO: 5200/1290

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: IMPLICATIONS OF U.S. BINARY-ARMS DECISION FOR PROPOSED BAN

Deployment in Europe Predicted

LD201803 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS---TASS commentator Yevgeniy Verlin writes:

Approving on Wednesday the appropriations for the creation of new types of chemical weapons, the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress thus blessed another step of the administration along the road of speeding up the preparation for chemical warfare in Europe. It is precisely in Europe that Washington intends to deploy deadly binary nerve weapons. A plant for their production was just built at Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Exactly seven decades ago Europeans were the first in mankind's history to undergo the horrible effects of toxic agents. Following Germany, other warring sides resorted to the use of nerve gases during the First World War. Gas attacks caused the death toll of hundreds of thousands, while millions became invalids with affected lungs.

The signing on June 17, 1925 by European Governments of the Geneva Protocol banning the use of asphyxiating, toxic or other such gases at war was caused by the awareness of the catastrophic consequences with which chemical war is fraught for the most densely populated continent.

The United States did not join the Geneva Protocol then. It demanded a "certain time" for reflection. And this "reflection" has dragged out for nearly 50 years in the course of which Washington staged a large-scale war in Vietnam. And on the 60th anniversary of the Geneva Protocol, June 17, Reagan held in the White House a session of "arm twisting" applied to legislators who are hesitant on the question of binary weapons.

It is only the gullible who can believe assurances of representatives of the White House that the Pentagon will not be deploying new types of chemical weapons in Western Europe, specifically on the territory of the FRG. The United States is producing and developing binary charges precisely for those armaments that have been or are being deployed by the United States in Europe, including "Pershing-2" and cruise missiles.

19 July 1985

Sober-minded Europeans realise that their continent is threatened not only with nuclear but also with chemical holocaust. Stockpiles of chemical arms that are enough for destroying all life in Europe have already been stockpiled at U.S. military bases in Europe. This concern was reflected in a draft treaty on the creation of a zone free from chemical weapons in central Europe, the draft treaty drawn up by experts of the SUPG (GDR) AND SPDG (FRG). The draft treaty with which representatives of the press and public were familiarised in Bonn yesterday will be referred to the governments of the GDR and FRG and of all other countries concerned.

Socialist countries are prepared to take concrete and effective measures in the appropriate direction. The proposal of the Warsaw Treaty countries of January 1983 to all countries concerned to embark on the talks to rid Europe of chemical weapons remains valid. Now that Washington is at the start of a new stage of chemical preparations, the question is posed acutely whether Europe should say a unanimous "no" to their continent being turned into a U.S. chemical "powder keg."

U.S. Blocks Ban

LD171534 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS--TASS political news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

While projecting itself as a supporter of a ban on the chemical weapons, Washington is actually building up its chemical arsenals, developing new types of that brutal mass destruction weapon. The newspaper WASHINGTON POST reported today on support by the congressmen for a request of the administration on the appropriation of more than one billion dollars to "perfect the means of chemical defence" and "to continue research in the field of chemical weapons." As has already become a custom on Capitol Hill, they substantiate this stance by references to the effect that the United States is allegedly "lagging behind in that field."

Facts, however, indicate to the contrary. Already now, according to the calculations of the United States press itself, the United States has more than 150,000 tonnes of toxic substances, more than three million chemical shells, bombs and rockets. The U.S. administration has requested 163 million dollars from the Congress for the 1986 fiscal year for the production of binary nerve munitions alone. The Senate has recently approved this sum within the framework of the military budget.

The special commission on problems of the chemical weapons, which was set up by the White House early this year, has recently presented a report advocating an accelerated modernisation of the U.S. chemical arsenals. It is reported in this connection that along with the binary weapons, the United States is also testing other types of high-toxic agents.

The large-scale programme for a chemical rearmament of the United States, which is being carried out by the current Washington administration, provides for enlarging the stocks of chemical munitions to reach five million units. to build big depots, above all outside the United States--in Western Europe and Asia. It is easy to see what threat this presents to such densely populated regions.

It is sixty years today since the signing of the Geneva Protocol--the main international agreement banning the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons.

The Geneva Protocol was signed by around one hundred countries. The USSR was among the first signatories to that agreement, and it strictly observes all of its provisions. As far as the United States is concerned, it took that country almost half a century to accede, at long last, to the Geneva Protocol in 1975. In the meantime, at long last, to the Geneva Protocol in 1975. In the meantime, American toxic substances killed and crippled hundreds of thousands of people in Indochina and caused irreparable ecological damage there. Now, too, American chemical weapons are supplied to gangs of murderers in Afghanistan and in some other places.

Washington is actually blocking an international agreement prohibiting the chemical weapons. The draft basic provisions of a convention to ban the chemical weapons tabled by the USSR has been shelved at the Disarmament Conference in Geneva for almost three years now. The draft takes into account the viewpoints of other states. This is a good basis for an agreement. And no agreement has been reached so far solely because of the obstructionist stand of the United States.

U.S. Speeding Up Program

LD012023 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT 1 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 1 TASS--The Pentagon is speeding up preparations for chemical and bacteriological warfare. To this end it is planned to build new laboratories for the development of chemical and biological weapons in Dagway Military base in Utah State. The laboratories are designed to become a major centre for developing a new generation of mass destruction weapons.

As the American press points out, the Pentagon already has sufficient stocks of chemical and biological weapons to be able to kill every living thing on earth many times over. More than 55,000 tonnes of high toxic nerve agents and more than three million munitions filled with toxic agents are stored at present in the U.S. arsenals. The Reagan administration is planning to spend nearly ten million dollars on preparations for chemical and biological warfare until the year of 1987.

The Pentagon's plans have outraged the American public. Under public pressure the Federal judge of Washington ruled to suspend the construction underway in Utah base. Yet, as the U.S. Department of the Army said, this ban will not result in scrapping that project.

CSO: 5200/1290

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA REPORTS GERMAN PARTIES' PRESS CONFERENCE ON WEAPONS-FREE ZONE

PM241301 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Bonn"]

[Text] A joint press conference was held in Bonn 19 June by SED and Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD] representatives on the SED-SPD working party on questions of disarmament in the sphere of chemical weapons, at which a document prepared by the group was presented--the "Draft Agreement on Creating a Chemical-Weapon-Free Zone in Europe."

The press statement says, in particular, that the SED-SPD working party to discuss the possibilities of creating a chemical-weapon-free zone in Europe was formed as a result of an accord between E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and H.J. Vogel, chairman of the SPD faction in the Bundestag and deputy chairman of the SPD. The group's work resulted in the draft, which was approved by the SED Central Committee Politburo and the SPD Presidium. It is noted that it is proposed to use this initiative to give impetus to talks and to the conclusion by the relevant governments of a treaty on creating a chemical-weapon-free zone in Europe. Such a zone would promote the Geneva talks on a global ban on chemical weapons and would be an important step toward the practical implementation of detente, disarmament and confidence-building for the sake of establishing collective security in Europe.

According to the SED and SPD representatives' statement, the results of the working party's work will be submitted for examination by the United Nations, and first and foremost by the Geneva Disarmament Conference.

CSO: 5200/1290

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW: GREECE REPEATS INTENTION TO CLOSE U.S. BASES

LD242222 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Jun 85

[Text] Our correspondent Georgiy Voytsekhovskiy reports from Athens:

Greece has again confirmed its intention regarding the withdrawal of U.S. military bases from its territory. Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou made a statement on this in Parliament. He presented to deputies the program of the new government, formed after the victory of the Panhellenic Socialist Movement party, PASOK, at the recent general parliamentary elections. The program contains the chief directions of Greece's internal and foreign policy.

Setting these forth, Andreas Papandreou stated that the USA's military bases should be closed by 1988 with the expiration of the Greek-American agreement signed 2 years ago. Andreas Papandreou confirmed adherence to the new military doctrine, which was already put forward by him before the last parliamentary elections.

The essence of this doctrine lies in the fact that Greece, in determining the tactics and strategy of its military policy, will now proceed on the theory of the lack of a threat from the north, that is, from the Warsaw Pact countries. The Greek prime minister stated that the government intends to continue to pursue a constructive policy aimed at strengthening peace, detente, and disarmament. In this connection, he recalled the peaceful initiatives supported by Greece, in particular, regarding the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans and turning the Mediterranean Sea into a peace zone.

CSO: 5200/2179

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA ANSWERS LETTER ON NORDIC NFZ PROPOSAL

PM240931 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 5

[G. Valko answer to reader's letter: "Nuclear-Free Status for Northern Europe" -- first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] Why is the idea of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, which has wide support, not being put into practice?

L. Kuptsov (Riga).

The idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, which was put forward more than 20 years ago by Finnish President U. Kekkonen, has indeed put down deep roots. Public actions in favor of this proposal have become a daily occurrence. At official level too it is now being discussed more seriously than, say, in the sixties. A positive attitude toward the idea of a nuclear-free zone is enshrined in the statements of Sweden's social democratic government, the resolutions of the Danish and Icelandic parliaments, and the decisions of the Norwegian Social Democrats' congress.

What is attractive about the idea of nuclear-free zones? For the peoples of the countries which would like to form such a zone, it offers a higher degree of security. The states belonging to a nuclear-free zone would make a commitment not to produce nuclear weapons or deploy them on their territory. The nuclear powers, in turn, would pledge to respect the status of the nuclear-free zone and not use nuclear weapons against the countries belonging to it.

But not only the countries declaring themselves to be a nuclear-free zone would benefit. The cause of peace would benefit, since the creation of the zone is a real step toward limiting the proliferation of nuclear weapons and freeing the entire European Continent from both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons.

Naturally, those who gamble on the policy of strength and steer a course toward confrontation do not want to accept the idea of nuclear-free zones. The U.S. secretary of state once spilt the beans by saying that the proposal for a nuclear-free zone in Europe does not accord with Washington's "fundamental foreign policy goals." The generals and diplomats across the ocean have many times roundly called the Scandinavian politicians to order for coming out in favor of serious talks on a nuclear-free zone.

The adverse reaction of Washington and the North Atlantic bloc leadership to the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone has been the main brake on its implementation. This is not

only because Washington arrogates to itself the right to determine the course of its NATO bloc partners in the international arena (let us recall that three of the north European countries -- Norway, Denmark, and Iceland -- belong to this aggressive alliance). According to Washington's views, as the Finnish newspaper SUOMENMAA noted recently, no NATO state can declare itself to be nuclear-free or hinder the use of nuclear weapons on its territory. This would undermine the NATO strategy of "flexible response."

Naturally, people across the ocean do not confine themselves to theoretical arguments. In recent years, taking into account the strategic location of northern Europe, Washington has been strengthening its military presence in the region in every way. In the Scandinavian NATO countries they are setting up more and more new military bases and electronic surveillance points, extending airfields capable of taking heavy military planes, and carrying out large-scale military maneuvers. On various pretexts, Washington is trying to move nuclear weapons into northern Europe. Nor has the American military given up its plans to deploy cruise missiles on the territory of Norway, Denmark, and Iceland with conventional warheads for the time being, which, as is well known, can easily be replaced by nuclear ones.

In short, in recent years sufficient evidence has built up to provide unequivocal proof of NATO's increased military activeness on its "north flank." The Pentagon is trying to drag neutral Sweden into its militarist intrigues too. Nor is Finland ignored.

So the imperialist forces' nuclear ambitions are the source of Washington's attempts to exert pressure on the Scandinavian partners in the NATO bloc and persuade them to renounce their adopted principle of not deploying nuclear weapons on their territory or making bases available to foreign armed forces in peacetime. Hence the NATO staffs' "hostility" to the idea of a nuclear-free zone. To some extent the Washington hawks have succeeded, since the Scandinavian governments have not yet managed to come to an understanding about practical steps to implement the proposal to create a nuclear-free zone.

At the same time, in present conditions the political significance of this proposal is increasing all the time. The siting of U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons on the European Continent and the fact that the flight paths of U.S. cruise missiles cross the territory of Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland create a direct threat to those countries' populations. Not for nothing are the broadest public circles in northern Europe more and more persistently demanding concrete measures to create a nuclear-free zone in the region.

These demands meet with the understanding and support of the Soviet Union. In accordance with the principles of its peace-loving policy, our country consistently comes out in favor of such zones, in particular in northern Europe. The USSR has expressed readiness to act as a guarantor of certain measures -- substantial ones, at that -- in relation to its own territory adjacent to the zone, so as to strengthen its nuclear-free status. The USSR would also be prepared to discuss the question of giving the Baltic Sea nuclear-free status.

No, nuclear-free zones are not a starry-eyed dream. This is an entirely realistic idea, and if its implementation had not been hindered by the "Atlanticists," Europe would long -- since have gained an extensive oasis of security, thereby taking a step toward the elimination of the nuclear threat.

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

ICELANDIC GOVERNMENT CRITICIZED IN HANDLING NUCLEAR ARMS BAN

Reykjavik MORGUNBLADID in Icelandic 1 Jun 85 p 9

[Commentary by Staksteinar: "From NT and the World Press"]

[Excerpts] Subject of Staksteinar today are news of Iceland in the world press in connection with the discussion here on nuclear weapons. The matter is a complex and emotional one that can certainly be misunderstood if the greatest care is not exercised.

News of Iceland in the World Press

In a comparatively short period of time Iceland has twice appeared in the world press in connection with Althing discussions on nuclear weapons. The first time was on account on the words of Icelandic Foreign Minister Geir Hallgrimsson on the movement of ships with nuclear weapons within Icelandic waters and the second on account of the Foreign Affairs Committee proposal to the Althing on Disarmament. In both cases the foreign press has said that there is reason for concern. It was stated in the first instances abroad that the position of the Icelandic Foreign Minister is the same as that of the Government of New Zealand, which is not true. If the policy of Iceland in this area is to be compared with that of any other country it would be best to look at Norway.

In the second of the two connections there was published in the pages of the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE a news item reproduced above [not published]. As can be seen from it, the item is assigned to the Reuters News Agency and in it it is reported that the Althing has unanimously resolved to make Iceland into a "nuclear-free-zone."

Whatever people will wish to say about the Althing resolution and however they will wish to interpret it, it is not possible to come to the conclusion that through it Iceland has been declared a "nuclear-free-zone." That concept has, to be sure, the same murky meaning as the proposal of the Foreign Affairs Committee as a whole, sufficient distinction is, however, made in the "mass media discussions" that people can realize that Iceland has not declared itself a nuclear-free-zone.

Although politicians make a big thing about making peace with one another in peace and disarmament matters in the Icelandic Althing, they should be careful in making resolutions in these areas that these resolutions are so clear and certain that they cannot be misunderstood. It is also important that those who have duty of explaining to foreigners what is being done in these matters in Iceland should discuss the matters in such a way that there will be no misunderstanding of Icelandic policy in this weighty area. This was the case, however, in both of the cases mentioned above.

9857

CSO: 3636/38

NUCLEAR TESTING

BRIEFS

AUSTRALIA WELCOMES CALLS FOR BAN--Australia has welcomed renewed calls for France to stop its nuclear tests in the South Pacific. The first protest was in a resolution to the European Parliament by eight Dutch MP's which called for an immediate end to nuclear tests at Mururoa Atoll. The resolution has yet to be debated, but it also supported efforts for a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. A similar resolution was passed by the South Pacific Permanent Commission, which comprises Chile, Colombia, Peru, and Ecuador. Australia's foreign affairs minister, Mr Hayden, welcomed the two motions, saying France should pay heed to the strongly felt views of the countries in the Pacific which were supported widely throughout the world. Mr Hayden said the protests, together with consistent opposition to the Mururoa tests by all members of the South Pacific Forum clearly showed concern at France's continuing defiance of the wishes of the region. The Australian minister said that despite this, France has set off more than a hundred nuclear explosions in the Pacific, the latest one being on 7 June. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0130 GMT 27 Jun 85 BK]

PRAVDA REPORTS FRENCH TEST--New York, 12 Jun--Frankly ignoring protests from states in the South Pacific, Paris is continuing nuclear tests in French Polynesia. An AP correspondent reports from Wellington that the New Zealand Government Seismological Service has recorded an underground detonation of a nuclear device on Mururoa Atoll. This is the 4th test this year and the 71st since France embarked on the implementation of its program of nuclear experiments on Mururoa 10 years ago. Last month on the same testing range France carried out the most powerful nuclear blast in recent years, with a yield of about 150 kilotons, provoking a storm of indignation and protests from the states of the region. Addressing journalists in Wellington, New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange resolutely denounced France's latest nuclear test. [Text] [Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 85 First Edition p 5]

CSO: 5200/1292

END